

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AID FOR DEPENDENT  
CORPORATIONS

## HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, in light of all the present talk about cutting the budget for this year, there has so far been little attention focused on one of the most bloated areas of Federal spending: corporate welfare. Corporate welfare refers to the tax breaks and outright grants that Government gives to big business. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Government last year lost \$140 billion from these programs. This is significantly more than the current cost of Medicare, Medicaid, veteran's medical care, and child nutrition programs combined.

There is concern whenever one discovers waste, fraud, and abuse in programs designed to help out the less fortunate. There should be a more acute sense of outrage to find that both profitable and poorly managed businesses can receive such huge subsidies, particularly in a time of budget austerity.

A few examples poignantly illustrate this fact:

Of the nearly \$20 billion that the Agriculture Department spends for its subsidy programs, nearly 70 percent, or \$14 billion, goes to the largest one fifth of farm producers. These are quite often not family farms, but are rather large agribusinesses.

Recent reports by the General Accounting Office and the Grace Commission on waste in Government, noted a high amount of corporate welfare in the Medicaid, Medicare, housing assistance, and food programs. By not instituting free market, common sense, competitive procurement methods for goods and services, these four agencies alone fail to get the best prices for the goods they buy, resulting in excessive spending of \$5 to \$10 billion annually. The only ones who benefit from these are the companies who provide these overpriced items.

The Export-Import Bank is a Federal program designed to provide credit subsidies on exports. Of its \$3.1 billion budget for 1982, half of this money benefited just 10 large and profitable companies, 7 of which are on the Fortune 500 list. While this program has been scaled back, this "bank" still has \$17 billion in outstanding credit to major corporations. Ending this program would save \$13 billion over the next 4 years.

Perhaps the most well-known area of "aid for dependent corporations" is in the realm of energy production. In 1917, as America entered World War I and faced a national emergency, Congress granted oil companies tax incentives to encourage oil exploration. Instead of terminating this program as would appear to be logical immediately after the war, Congress extended this tax break to many other natural resource businesses. The result: In 1983, oil companies alone received 4.75 billion dollars' worth of these tax subsidies along with \$1.9 billion in outright research grants.

In the late 1970's Congress threw more of the taxpayers' money at large corporations with the belief that this would solve our energy and economic problems. The Synthetic Fuels Corporation [SFC] was created in 1980 to forge a relationship between Government and business that would develop new artificial fuels, primarily by converting America's vast coal reserves into liquid and gas forms of energy.

The SFC has been authorized to spend \$13.2 billion since 1980, and is expected to receive \$4 to \$8 billion in fiscal years 1986-92. The program could spend up to \$88 billion in this period, however, as this is the 1980 "limit" Congress set on the program.

There are, however, high capital and operating costs to any of these projects. It is estimated that it would cost \$5 to \$8 billion for a coal liquefaction plant that would produce only 50,000 barrels of coal liquid—that is, oil—a day. The initial goal set by the SFC was to have 500,000 barrels produced daily by 1987. The fact that of the 52 important synthetic fuel patents issued so far, 49 are to major corporations, also reflects the enormous potential for high Government subsidies.

America gained its economic greatness not by having business concentrate on ways it would get the optimum benefits from a complex tax code. America became great because of incentives that appealed to innovative, risktaking, and farsighted entrepreneurs, both big and small. Individuals and businesses should not be taxed so that they can subsidize large corporate undertakings.

Our Government should re-create the incentives and opportunities that it has replaced with corporate welfare and poverty traps. Once this is accomplished, our country will truly be on the road to full employment and the high levels of growth our people need.

I commend to my colleagues the following excellent essays by columnists

Donald Lambro and James Kilpatrick on this important issue facing the Congress.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 26, 1985]

"CORPORATE WELFARE" IS THEIR TARGET

(By Donald Lambro)

Ralph Nader and President Reagan agree on at least one thing: Congress can sharply reduce the deficit by cutting back on the billions of dollars Uncle Sam spends on "corporate welfare."

A recent report compiled by Mr. Nader's Public Citizen's Congress Watch offers a richly detailed blueprint for slashing the budget's lucrative AFDC programs.

No, AFDC isn't Aid for Dependent Children. It's "Aid for Dependent Corporations"—a growing but little-noticed gold mine in the federal spending machine that is enriching America's wealthiest business interests with billions in loans, subsidies, credits, and other assistance.

There is nothing especially new on Mr. Nader's AFDC hit list. The liberal consumer crusader long has pushed for cuts in corporate assistance and tax subsidies. What is new is that Mr. Reagan's latest budget aggressively attacks many of these same corporate goodies, challenging Congress this year to cut deeply into boardroom welfare, not social welfare.

Such an unholy alliance offers new budget-cutting opportunities on which congressional liberals and conservatives surely can agree. Consider a few of the most outrageous examples from Washington's corporate gravy train:

## EXPORT IMPORT BANK

Almost half of Ex-Im's \$3.1 billion in cut-rate loans in 1982 benefited just 10 big corporations, seven of which were on the Fortune 500 list, including Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and Westinghouse. Ending direct subsidized loans would save \$400 million in 1986 and \$13 billion over the next four years.

## URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS

This heavily politicized, \$544 million slush fund gives money to a handful of cities—20 have received 44 percent of all UDAG dollars—which, in turn, use it to assist corporate development. UDAGs have built 262 hotels and have subsidized big companies like Hyatt Corp., Sherwin-Williams, and General Motors. They've also helped to build luxury and middle-class housing.

## AIRLINE SUBSIDIES

Since 1978, taxpayers have shelled out nearly half a billion dollars in subsidies to regional airlines to preserve so-called "essential service" to smaller communities. However, such subsidies are no longer needed.

Nearly half of the market getting these subsidies are within 100 miles of a major airport, and thus are unfairly competing with cheaper transportation alternatives. The Office of Management and Budget found the per-person roundtrip subsidy to fly from Los Angeles to Blythe, Calif., was \$1,096. "At 80 cents per mile, the same passenger

could have used the subsidy to take a taxi to Las Vegas, lose \$500 at blackjack, and take a taxi home, with cash to spare," says OMB.

#### AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES

Contrary to the poor-family-farmer image given to the recipients of the Commodity Credit Corp.'s multibillion-dollar payments, the truth is that big agribusinesses take the lion's share of the subsidies.

For example, the biggest 9.4 percent of the nation's wheat farmers, those owning 1,000 or more acres, reaped 42 percent of CCC's deficiency payments. The largest 12.8 percent of corn farmers got 40 percent of the payments.

Curbing payments to the big farm corporations would save a huge chunk of next year's estimated \$12.5 billion in CCC subsidies.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

How would you like to borrow money at 5 percent, with 35 years to pay? These are REA's heavily subsidized terms for direct loans to electric and telephone utilities, which are owned by big tax-exempt cooperatives or independent corporations.

Federal REA subsidies will total \$2.6 billion next year. Who benefits from them? Big business and middle-class residential users who receive substantially reduced electric rates. Savings from an REA phase-out: \$5.1 billion over the next five years.

Uncle Sam's list of corporate welfare clients is much longer, including \$330 million for Synfuels Corp. giveaways, \$1 billion for the inland waterway barge operators, and \$1.1 billion for the nuclear energy industry.

"To say fairness demands that corporate welfare be cut when aid to old, blind, and disabled people has already been cut is laboring the obvious," says Mr. Nader's Public Citizen's group.

That liberals like Mr. Nader and conservatives like Mr. Reagan can agree on curbing many of these expenditures bodes well for cutting them from the budget this year.

[From the Asbury Park Press, Mar. 1, 1985]

#### "CORPORATE WELFARE" UNFAIR TO ALL OF US

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Over the past three years, the General Electric Co. had profits of \$6.5 billion. It paid no federal income tax. Dow Chemical had profits of \$776 million; Union Carbide had profits of \$613 million; W.R. Grace & Co. had profits of \$684 million. None of them paid a dime in federal income tax. Together the four companies claimed refunds—refunds, if you please!—of more than half a billion dollars.

This is corporate welfare. It is the system of tax avoidance known cynically as AFDC—Aid for Dependent Corporations—and it is the indefensible consequence of tax laws passed with the very best intentions.

It is not yet clear whether Congress will act on tax reform this year. In the House, Dan Rostenkowski says that his Committee on Ways and Means is ready to cooperate with the administration. In the Senate, majority leader Bob Dole says that reducing deficits has a higher priority than simplifying taxes. My own thought is that if Congress fails to tackle tax reform in 1985, it is not likely to tackle tax reform in the election year of 1986. The lobbyists will be out like tree frogs in April.

For a variety of reasons, both tangible and intangible, a wholesale revision of the tax code gets more urgent all the time. It is now clear that the investment tax credit has not worked as its sponsors hoped it would work when they put it on the books 20-odd years

ago. The idea seemed attractive: To spur capital investment in new equipment, give a company an outright credit of 10 percent on such investments. Will you buy a \$200,000 rotary press? Then deduct \$20,000 from your corporate income tax.

The investment tax credit may have helped the machine tool industry; it may have benefited other suppliers of equipment, but gains in productivity probably have been purchased at the price of eliminating jobs. In the coming fiscal year, if the act is not repealed or drastically amended, the Treasury will have to grant \$38 billion in credits. These credits are outright subsidies to industry, in no way distinguishable from such subsidies as food stamps for the poor.

Another target for tax reform is the program of accelerated cost recovery. This is the principal program that has permitted such firms as General Electric and Dow Chemical to escape federal income taxes. They can write off most new equipment in five years and most new structures in 15 years. The program will cost the Treasury an estimated \$22 billion in fiscal '86.

To be sure, plausible arguments can be made that tax breaks for business, including Very Big Business, are good things for the economy. In theory these credits and write-offs provide incentives for American companies to invest in new and modernized plants that will make them more competitive on world markets. There is not much evidence either to prove or to disprove the theory. Most new plants probably would have been built anyhow.

No such arguments support continuation of tax shelters for individuals. These phantom investments result in a loss to the Treasury of roughly \$20 billion to \$25 billion a year. You see these cynical schemes advertised in daily newspapers in professional journals: Invest only \$2,000! Become a limited partner! Wealthy individuals are urged to put a little money into oil, gas, real estate, horses, treasure hunts, cattle, kiwi fruit, jojoba beans, duck farms, oyster farms, and even the breeding of llamas. The investments make a mockery of our capitalist system, for the whole object is not to earn money but to lose money—to provide tax losses for the rich.

These sleazy schemes of tax avoidance do incalculable damage. They divert capital from truly productive enterprises and they contribute significantly to a public perception of unfairness in the tax laws. It may not be perfectly understood, but it is generally understood, that when the rich doctor, dentist or lawyer finds refuge in a tax shelter, it is the ordinary Joe who is being ripped off. The little guy's taxes have to make up the gap when 9,000 persons earning \$250,000 or more pay no income taxes at all.

The Treasury's program of tax simplification is far from perfect, but it provides a good starting point. Other bills—Kemp-Kasten, Bradley-Gephardt—have great merit. It remains only for Congress to demonstrate the will to do what has to be done. ●

#### THE PLIGHT OF OUR ELDERLY

#### HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to discuss problems facing the elderly in our society today.

One of my constituents recently sent me a copy of a letter she wrote to the commissioner of the Georgia Department of Human Resources. As a Medicaid specialist, she describes the plight of the elderly as she sees it. I'm submitting her letter for my colleagues' review:

DEAR COMMISSIONER LEDBETTER, I have just read your article in the Human Side, "We Must Build On Our Strength". It has moved me to write to you. The list of areas on which to focus attention caught my eye because the objectives regarding our elderly were both on the bottom of the list. Realizing that you did not necessarily list them in order of importance, it still brings to my mind that benefits for our elderly always seem to be on the bottom.

Now let me introduce myself—I am the Medicaid Specialist for Spalding County and have been dealing with Medicaid benefits for the elderly for almost 17 years. We have three nursing homes here and very few other alternatives for those people. I see changes in our System daily but there never seems to be any added benefits for our elderly. I firmly believe in what our Bible tells us about caring for widows and elderly parents; however, society has forgotten that over the years and our System has made people dependent on the government to assume these responsibilities.

Realizing that I cannot turn back the hands of time, I am daily aware that our elderly reap the least benefits from our System. For example, a Medicaid recipient in the nursing home is allowed to keep only \$25 of their monthly income, and that has not changed in many years. While the cost of medication (above Medicaid covered drugs) has risen and the cost of personal care items has risen, these people are forced to do without many things because \$25 doesn't even cover the cost of those drugs above the Medicaid coverage allowed. Who can be decently buried for \$1,500.00 life insurance?

When is the last time that limit was raised? As more and more programs are implemented (Medically Needy for AFDC, for example) for the younger generation, we have thousands of elderly at home with income under \$400 per month who do without much needed medical care because there is no program to help with medical care for them. You and I know that it takes more than \$400 just for basic necessities such as food, shelter and utilities.

Many of our elderly are forced to enter nursing homes simply to be eligible for Medical Assistance. These people could remain in their own homes or with relatives if they had a means of paying for medical care. Why do we not provide a Medical Care Program for these people who can survive on their income, but cannot pay for medical care?

We provide assistance to so many young, healthy mothers simply because they have

a child under six years old—what happened to the service workers who used to work with these mothers to obtain training, education or whatever was necessary for employment? What has happened to the time when a "Social Worker" helped to teach these people to be independent and self-supporting?

In 1968 when I came to work for DFCS, we had two eligibility workers, two child welfare workers, and a number of service workers. Today, we have 20 eligibility workers, 10 child welfare workers, two homemakers, one service intake worker and nine secretaries (as opposed to two in 1968) to handle the enormous amount of paper work. This kind of growth surely must tell all of us in what areas we have grown: child welfare cases, Food Stamp cases and AFDC cases. No services except one homemaker and one Medicaid worker to handle all the Medicaid eligibility for the elderly and disabled.

Please understand that I am not complaining about the Medicaid caseload number and work involved (I can handle the work and love every person I deal with and am blessed every day by this caseload), but am simply making the point that benefits for the elderly have remained at the bottom while all other benefits have grown tremendously!

This week has just been a time of startling realization for me that while our Department has grown astonishingly in paperwork and caseload numbers, benefits for the elderly have not grown at all.

It creates a real pain of inefficiency to deal daily with so many people who could make it on their income but go without much needed medical care because they cannot possibly pay a hospital bill of \$100 a month for medicine.

Somewhere along the time line we lost touch with helping people to become self-sufficient and independent and forgot the God-given command to take care of widows and elderly. Is there any hope at all for our elderly in the near future? What can I, as a private citizen and as a professional do to help to bring to light one of the greatest needs in our society?

Your goals are also my goals: to achieve a Healthier Generation of Georgians, Economic Self-Sufficiency and Independence for Older Georgians. Does Independence for older Georgians have to be on the bottom of the list?

Thanks you so much for listening and caring. I realize the position you hold carries with it a great deal of responsibility that even I do not know about. I pledge to do my very best to support my county and state department and always serve with deep respect and admiration the people in my caseload.

Respectfully,

Ms. SONDRA T. BALLEW,  
Caseworker Principal, MAO.

I hope we'll all stop and consider the points Sondra Ballew makes in this letteq. And that we'll help to change the deplorable situation the elderly face in our society today.●

## THE MX MISSILE

### HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, soon this body will be asked once again to debate and consider the question of the MX missile.

The argument being utilized to support the proposition that we should release \$1.5 billion to produce an additional 21 MX missiles is that our arms control negotiators need this to enhance their bargaining power with the Soviet Union. This is a most curious position.

First, it is widely held that the MX missile is an ineffective weapon in terms of the primary function of our nuclear weaponry: Retaliation.

Second, the MX is a destabilizing weapon with use only as a first-strike missile.

Third, our country already is loaded with strategic weaponry useful in any bargaining scenario with the Soviets at Geneva.

Finally, given the strategic ineffectiveness and the danger posed by the first-strike MX missile, the cost for this "bargaining chip" is prohibitive. At a time when many of our people are suffering unemployment due to the transition taking place in the international economy, with jobs being exported to cheap labor markets abroad, and at a time when we are being asked by the administration to freeze, cut, or eliminate the very programs designed to cushion our citizens through difficult times, we can ill afford to provide a \$1.5 billion "bargaining chip" for anyone. We have security needs at home as well as abroad.

Let's get ready to vote against this wasteful system.●

### LARCHMONT LAWYER IS CITED FOR EFFORT AGAINST CORRUPTION

#### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the accomplishments of Joseph Fisch. Mr. Fisch has spent 25 years fighting government and police corruption and mismanagement. He was recently cited by the International Association of Chiefs of Police "for his outstanding contribution to law enforcement."

Because of his distinguished career as a prosecutor and investigator, I'm sure accomplishments will be of interest to the Members of this body. I

submit the following article for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1985]

LARCHMONT LAWYER IS CITED FOR EFFORT AGAINST CORRUPTION

(By Franklin Whitehouse)

LARCHMONT.—In 25 years as a prosecutor and investigator, Joseph Fisch has fought corruption and mismanagement in police departments from Syracuse to New York City and from Albany to New Rochelle. Now the police have honored him for it.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police recently gave the trim, precise 52-year-old lawyer a special citation "for his outstanding contribution to law enforcement" during a career that has also included fighting organized crime in Yonkers and investigating the New York City hospital system.

Mr. Fisch, who has lived here for 11 years, has also been asked for advice on organizational and other matters by law enforcement agencies as far apart as Santa Fe, N.M., and Mamaroneck.

For the last 14 months, the Harvard Law School graduate has been deputy inspector general of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and its general counsel. He came to the authority's Manhattan headquarters from Kew Gardens, where he had spent seven years on the staff of the Queens District Attorney.

Before Queens, Mr. Fisch has served for 18 years with the Temporary New York State Commission of Investigation, most recently as deputy commissioner and counsel.

Mr. Fisch has no particular aversion to police officers, Paul J. Curran, the former Commission Chairman, said last week. He just "developed a certain feel for the situation" when officers were not doing their jobs. Mr. Curran said in a telephone interview.

"I regard myself as a career public servant," Mr. Fisch said the other day in his living room, sitting beside an Elaine de Kooning portrait of President Kennedy. "I feel outraged when there's a betrayal of public trust."

Testifying in 1971 at a public hearing in New York, Mr. Fisch said that the city police department's war on heroin traffic was being hampered by a number of corrupt practices, including direct involvement of police officers in the sale of narcotics.

One of his witnesses was Frank Serpico, a police officer after whom a later motion picture about the case was named.

The investigation, for which Mr. Fisch was chief counsel, was "an incredibly good effort," Mr. Curran said. "We weren't just looking for corruption, although we found it. We found they also weren't making the right kinds of cases. The police were not going up the ladder, they were just busting junkies."

The international police chiefs group said Mr. Fisch was the first public official to expose corruption in the city narcotics trade and, combined with the disclosures of the Knapp Commission, prompted Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller to create the office of special prosecutor for the city's criminal-justice system.

Soon after Mr. Fisch accepted his M.T.A. appointment in December 1983, he encountered Delores A. Battalia, the newly elected Mamaroneck Town Supervisor, at a political victory party.

Mrs. Battalia, in an interview last week, said that she had been trying to meet Mr.

Fisch to ask him to study the town police force, which, she said, had had "a long-term history of difficulty," including a chief who had resigned in 1981 and pleaded guilty to several criminal charges. The town has had seven police chiefs in 20 years.

Mr. Fisch agreed to do the job on his own time, at no cost. He began interviewing officers as they came off their shifts at night and on weekends. Thirty-eight of the force's 39 officers agreed to talk about operational and morale problems, Mrs. Battalia said.

"The men felt the town had ignored them for years," Mrs. Battalia said. "Joe gave them a chance to ventilate with someone they respected as a professional."

After six months, the Town Board acted on the principal recommendation in Mr. Fisch's 75-page report and named its first full-time professional Police Commissioner, Arthur Dallas. Commissioner Dallas holds the authority of a former three-member civilian volunteer police commission.

Mrs. Battalia described Mr. Fisch as "very precise, orderly and careful in his choice of words. He's obviously someone who's used to walking into an unknown situation and knows how to handle it."

However, opposition to the choice of Commissioner Dallas has come from the Tri-County Federation of Police, which has sued "to protect the status" of Chief Baumblatt, according to the federation's executive director, Ralph M. Purdy.

Chief Baumblatt, a former Mamaroneck sergeant appointed by the old civilian commission, is subordinate to Commissioner Dallas, a former New York City police lieutenant who lives in Rye.

In 1976, Mr. Fisch visited Santa Fe at the invitation of the state's Organized Crime Prevention Commission to share his "experience and expertise in this field," according to the international police chiefs.

Part of the experience was in Yonkers in 1968 when Mr. Fisch helped to investigate the involvement of organized crime in the private garbage-carting industry.

Mr. Fisch's father owned a grocery store on Stanton Street on Manhattan's Lower East Side, where he worked as a boy on Sundays. Born on Jan. 10, 1933, Mr. Fisch graduated in 1953 from New York University and in 1956 from Harvard, where he was president of the Law School Forum, a student organization that invited prominent outsiders to speak.

Mr. Fisch's first project at the M.T.A. was to conduct an inquiry into allegations by Transit Authority employees that high-ranking authority supervisors, including its President, David Gunn, had directed delays in inspection of new R-62 subway cars ordered from a manufacturer in Japan.

Mr. Fisch said his inquiry, which culminated in a December 1984 report, had failed to turn up corroboration for the charges against Mr. Gunn but had resulted in a warning to another executive, Richard Goodlatte.

The Fisch office supervises litigations, makes recommendations on investigations and conducts unannounced inspections of such M.T.A. facilities as the Harmon maintenance ship in Croton-on-Hudson.

Mr. Fisch, who said he was now working on a "highly hush, hush thing" with the M.T.A.'s Inspector General Sanford E. Russell, commutes on Metro-North's New Haven Line to his office at 10 Columbus Circle. He lives here with his wife, Betty, a New York City school teacher and their 13-year-old daughter, Beth Rachel. ●

## THE SITUATION IN ECUADOR

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a summary of the presentation of His Excellency Mario Ribadeneira, Ambassador of Ecuador to the United States, to the Americas Society in New York on November 28, 1984. As this presentation shows, Ecuador is doing a lot of things right to foster its own development, and is a good friend of the United States. As we begin consideration of the annual foreign aid legislation, I hope the Congress and the administration will be prepared to provide adequate support for Ecuador's efforts.

The material referred to follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PRESENTATION OF H.E. MARIO RIBADENEIRA TO THE "AMERICAS SOCIETY" NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 28, 1984

When the Government of President Leon Febres Cordero was elected in Ecuador last year, a philosophy and approach to the role of government which is perhaps unique in South America began to make its presence known. President Febres Cordero, a businessman who received a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering at the Stevens Institute in the United States, is dedicated to giving the fullest role possible to private initiative and the private sector in the development of Ecuador. This means restraining the growth of the role of government, phasing out highly subsidized industrial development, and facilitating more natural and appropriate agro-industry. President Febres Cordero is also committed to the promotion of foreign investment. His government is, therefore, taking steps which make the business climate in Ecuador more hospitable to foreign know-how in both the oil and agricultural sectors where Ecuador has natural endowments and potential international commercial advantages.

To achieve these goals, Ecuador has recently become the first of the Andean countries and, for that matter, one of the few of the South American countries to conclude agreements with the Overseas Private Investment Corporation of the United States to permit arrangements for the issuance by OPIC of insurance for all investment risks in Ecuador. Investments in the following areas are now being explored: Agro-industry, fisheries, shrimp cultivation, mining, petroleum, low-price housing, etc.

Similarly, Ecuador has recently signed an agreement with the Occidental Petroleum Company for oil exploration which will allow Ecuador to continue to exploit this important resource on a sound economic basis. In particular, Occidental will undertake oil exploration with the understanding that it will assume all costs and risks associated with such exploration in areas where other oil resources have already been discovered. Should Occidental's efforts produce the discovery of additional resources then, and only then, will Occidental receive payment for its efforts through receipt of a minority portion of payment for its efforts through receipt of a minority portion of the associated oil revenues. Dr. Armand Hammer, Chairman of Occidental,

came to Ecuador on January 25, 1985 for signature of the agreement.

In the areas of agricultural resources, Ecuador has in recent months taken many steps to facilitate the further growth of its increasingly important role as an exporter. In addition, Ecuador and the Inter-American Development Bank recently signed loan agreements for the completion of a \$403 million project for the irrigation of a major coastal area of Ecuador. This area will benefit from the project in a manner reminiscent of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States. In other agricultural sectors where Ecuador also has an important natural comparative advantage, such as fresh fruit, vegetables, and other perishables, Ecuador is now welcoming investment of medium-sized firms.

Finally, Ecuador is among those countries which have behaved responsibly toward their foreign creditors and fully honors all its obligations. As a vote of confidence in the philosophy of President Febres Cordero, in December, 1984, 400 commercial banks completed negotiations with Ecuador for a multi-year (1985-89) rescheduling of all government debt with private banks (approximately \$4.6 billion). This amount will be rescheduled over 12 years with a 3-year grace period, amounting to a savings of nearly \$150 million in debt service payments. This agreement, the first multi-year rescheduling for a small debtor country, will be effective upon completion of a standby agreement for 1985 with the IMF, which is expected in January or February of this year.

There is little doubt that the Ecuadorean Government and the IMF will come to terms, given their shared ideology regarding economic stabilization. In particular, the Febres Cordero Government has already initiated a stabilization plan including monetary adjustment to place Ecuadorean exports in more competitive positions, lifting price controls from agricultural commodities, reducing protective tariffs on industrial goods, and increasing the price of domestic fuels. These steps will help achieve the goal on which IMF and Ecuador agree of reinstating economic growth and maintaining inflation at 20% by the end of the year with an average of 24% for 1985. Salary increases will also be scaled to compensate 1985 inflation rates. In addition, Ecuador's Monetary Board has legislated changes to bring interest rates more in line with inflation, recently raising the rate for commercial operations two points to 23%. Interest rates on savings and time deposits were raised by the same amount to 20% and 22% respectively.

As a result of the rescheduling program, the first principal payment by Ecuador will be made in 1988 on 2.5% of the total. Amortization will rise gradually to 10% in 1991, 15% in 1993, and 17% in 1996. The interest rate will be 1.375 points over 3-months LIBOR, or the adjusted CD rate. There will be no refinancing fee.

Thus, Ecuador is now poised to begin building on the very solid foundations of its assets including its industrious people, its sound and sensible government, its natural resources, and its friendships in government and business in the United States and the Western world. ●

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF  
LAKE COUNTY COMMUNITY  
ACTION PROJECT

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of joining the citizens of Lake County, IL, in celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Lake County Community Action Project. The following letter describes a few of the many contributions made by the LCCAP during its 20-year existence:

MARCH 13, 1985.

Mrs. BARBARA GORDON,  
Lake County Community Action Project,  
Waukegan, IL.

DEAR MRS. GORDON: It is with great pride that I join with all the citizens of Lake County in saluting the Lake County Community Action Project on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. Under the hard-working leadership of yourself and Shirley Goldman, the team of LCCAP employees and volunteers has brought self-esteem and hope to the disadvantaged, many of whom would have had nowhere else to turn.

In the two decades that have gone by since the agency initiated its "War on Poverty," LCCAP has been instrumental in opening up opportunity for the poor and needy in Lake County and giving them a chance to improve their lives. At a time when many Americans have grown skeptical of government social services, I commend LCCAP for proving that implementation of worthwhile programs can be done and done well.

Through the years you have functioned with kindness and sensitivity, but also with intelligence and foresight, knowing that changing times call for changing attitudes. As you reach this twenty-year milestone, you continue to demonstrate an understanding that methods must be updated to best meet the needs of today's clients, who are well served by your clear vision of the future.

I commend each of your board members over the last 20 years who have supplied the drive and determination that is the foundation of your success. LCCAP is a shining example to the nation of what can be achieved through the American tradition of reaching out to help those in need.

It is with great appreciation that I extend my wishes to your agency for continued future success.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. PORTER,  
Member of Congress.●

IMPORT QUOTAS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues an article which I wrote for the Cincinnati Enquirer on Monday, March

18, entitled "The Death of Import Quotas."

[The article follows:]

THE DEATH OF IMPORT QUOTAS

(By Bill Gradison of Ohio)

President Reagan has decided against asking Japan to renew its "voluntary" limits on auto exports to the United States which expire on March 31. This was the right decision and I applaud him for making it.

The voluntary restraint agreement (VRA) with Japan was bad policy from the start. Protectionist policies are generally counterproductive. The VRA is no exception.

Even if the VRA ever served any valid purpose, it has now become obsolete. The fact that the big three American automobile companies—General Motors, Ford and Chrysler—together reported \$9.8 billion in profits last year attests to that point.

Without question, the VRA, which limits Japanese auto exports to the U.S. to 1.68 million cars annually, has increased demand for U.S. automobiles, but it has also raised prices of both American and Japanese cars. As a direct result of the restraints, the price of small cars increased by an average of about \$370 per car in the 1981-1983 period.

The purpose of the quotas was to save jobs in American auto industry and to give it a chance to adjust to competition from Japan. In that respect, the quotas have been somewhat effective. From 26,000 to 44,000 auto industry jobs can be attributed to the quotas.

An important point, however, should not be overlooked: Each "saved" job carried a hefty price. As a direct result of the restraints, the average price of U.S. cars rose by about \$400 in 1983, and the average price of Japanese imports rose \$1,000. The cost to consumers, then, was over \$4.3 billion. This works out to a subsidy of between \$97,000 and \$165,000 per job saved.

Moreover, the extra consumer dollars sent to both U.S. and Japanese automakers as a result of the VRA simply means less money sent elsewhere—for other consumer purchases or for investment (through consumer saving). Thus, the flip side of the jobs saved in the U.S. auto sector is the U.S. jobs lost in the non-auto sectors. And, because workers in non-auto sectors generally earn far less than auto workers, the number of jobs lost because of the VRA likely exceeds the number of jobs saved! That is, the VRA has resulted in a net loss of American jobs.

We must question the wisdom of a policy which is harmful to so many (consumers in general and certain non-auto workers in particular) and beneficial to so few. The high visibility of "saved" auto jobs has tended to further obscure the relative invisibility of the jobs lost because of the VRA.

The U.S. auto industry had begun to adjust to the new world of high gasoline prices and international competition before the VRA was negotiated with Japan in 1981. But, ironically, the recent protection of the U.S. auto industry has actually benefited Japanese automobile producers by at least an extra \$2 billion per year because of the higher prices they have been able to charge in the U.S.

Put another way, the VRA has exported profits to Japan (as well as Detroit). A tariff would have produced the same results in the domestic industry, while benefiting Americans instead of Japanese.

Furthermore, when the export restraints were negotiated in 1981, the United States failed to link them to specific commitments by the American auto industry. As a result,

the quotas have merely imbued the U.S. industry with an artificial sense of security and success, actually creating disincentives to launching major auto-related investment programs, lowering production costs and improving its competitive position.

General Motors, for example, spent \$2.5 billion to acquire Electronic Data Systems Corp., among other non-auto investments; its well-advertised new Saturn small-car project, on the other hand, will cost only one-fifth as much.

Some people, in and out of the auto industry, fear that without an official export restraint, the Japanese will flood the American automobile market. That is a possibility, but it is much more likely that the Japanese will be reluctant to increase their U.S. exports too rapidly. Not only have they been able to raise prices and increase profits under the restraints, they also fear even stricter quotas—the non-voluntary variety.

I am glad that President Reagan listened to those of us who have disparaged the "voluntary" export restraints from the beginning. The restraints have sent the wrong signal to our auto industry. A more open market will mean lower automobile prices for American consumers, more jobs for American workers, and will, in my judgment, produce a greater incentive for the Japanese to negotiate more favorably with the United States on other important trade-related issues.●

MX FAILS AS MISSILE OR AS  
LEVER

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the March 13, 1985, edition of the New York Times.

The editorial, is a well considered evaluation of the vulnerability and ineffectiveness of the MX missile. As the body is now considering whether to build and deploy these weapons, I feel that the opinion of such a prominent newspaper would be of interest to the Members. I include this New York Times editorial for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1985]

MX FAILS, AS MISSILE OR AS LEVER

For President Reagan, the new arms control talks in Geneva offer the chance to strongarm Congress as well as the Soviet Union. Give me all the MX missiles I want, he says; they are essential to my negotiating position. That is certainly not the case he'd be making if he could argue that the MX is essential, also to national security.

Mr. Reagan is not alone in trying to use the discredited weapon as a negotiating tool. Rather than say no to the MX, several Congressmen, including the Democrats Les Aspin in the House and Sam Nunn in the Senate, propose to vote for limited MX deployment in exchange for influence over the Administration's performance in the arms talks.

The trouble with trying to use the MX for leverage, in either direction, is that it is a broken reed, either as a lever or a weapon.

Will the Russians at Geneva cooperatively trade their own heavy missile for the MX—or defiantly build more? Even if they are inclined to bargain, Mr. Reagan already has plenty of chips to bargain with. He has launched an extensive modernization of offensive strategic weapons, from the B-1 bomber to the accurate D-5 submarine-based missile. His "Star Wars" defense program is a hefty bargaining counter, far more likely than the MX to be at the center of negotiations.

And should there be intrinsic bargaining weight in MX missiles, well, Congress has already voted to build 21 of them. With testing and production well in hand, the mere threat of building more is enough. Last year Congress approved \$1.5 billion for production of an additional 21, but fenced in the funds. The Administration is asking both for that money to be released and for \$4 billion to buy a further batch of 48. But the case for putting the MX on hold is more compelling than ever.

The MX was conceived on a false premise, that the silos housing America's land-based Minuteman missiles were becoming vulnerable to increasingly accurate Soviet warheads. To make the MX invulnerable, the Carter Administration decided to base it in a mobile fashion in remote parts of Utah and Nevada, shuttling each missile between multiple shelters.

That was the unlikely "racetrack" system that Mr. Reagan rejected on taking office. But then he discovered that every other basing mode was vulnerable. Backed into a technical and political corner, he turned to a blue-ribbon panel of experts to help him out.

The Scowcroft commission was a brutal savior. It said the window of vulnerability never existed. That demolished the reason for an MX. Then it advocated housing the MX in the very Minuteman silos Mr. Reagan had declared to be so dismayingly vulnerable. The commission also recognized that the day of the multi-headed, land-based missile is ending. It recommended development of a single-headed missile, the "Midgetman," as an unthreatening, untempting target that would add both to security and to stability.

In short, the MX missile embodies a mistaken turn in nuclear strategy. With 10 accurate warheads, it must be considered by Soviet planners as a first-strike weapon. If it is vulnerable, it cannot deter. A weapons system that both threatens and is vulnerable to attack is the last thing needed in a crisis.

A mistake is no asset, even when dressed up as a bargaining chip. And to vote 21 more missiles is to double the error. If Congress wishes to influence the Administration's negotiating strategy, its best course when the issue comes up in the Senate next week is to keep the MX on hold. ●

TELEVISION COMMERCIAL CRITICISM

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives an interesting editorial published February 28, 1985, in Merrick

Life, a weekly newspaper in my Fourth Congressional District. The editorial expresses needed criticism of television commercials which feature in their advertising promotions two of our country's most beloved and respected leaders, Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. The advertisements to which I refer were done in poor taste and make a mockery of these two great American statesmen.

I'm pleased the paper's editors had the courage and the sense to express their concern that commercial advertising should be conducted in good taste and with proper respect for history and our Nation's leaders.

The editorial follows:

[From the Merrick Life, Feb. 28, 1985]

CALL OFF THE CLOWNS

Stop making a clown out of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. That is the feeling we'd like to express to TV commercial makers, after enduring the silly ones on view over the past weekend.

It is undignified for the father of his country, a patriot who fought many, long hard years to help bring this democracy into being, to be as demeaned as he is in those sales pitches for automobiles or other merchandise.

To have a figure in a false wig, supposedly George Washington, cavorting around among automobiles is undignified, and gives the younger generation some weird impression about a historical figure they are supposed to revere.

It is equally fallacious to take a clown in a tall hat and beard and indicate that he is President Lincoln advocating shopping at some discount store. The somber reality of Lincoln's life, and death are made a mockery of by such shenanigans.

It is perfectly all right to allude to the fact that February is the birth month of these great men. (Although the holidays, themselves, have been distorted in order to give a long weekend for vacationing or selling.)

But, it is not all right to have clowns dressed up like these commanding figures of our history and sent out to shill for a merchandiser.

How can we expect young people to have a real comprehension of the importance of these two presidents and their influence on the course of American history when they have visual impressions repeated over and over again on the graphic screen in their living room which make fools of heroes?

There are plenty of other ways to say and demonstrate that this is the time of the year that winter merchandise is put on sale.

The ingenuity of the producers of commercials has been well demonstrated. Then, why not drop this trite device, which is in such bad taste?

We'd like to say: "Cut it out!" Stop remaking history in your own pattern. Stop making something garish and silly out of what should be a dignified and informative reference to our nation's history.

If you agree, clip and send this to your favorite TV station or network. ●

SAVING AMTRAK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to eliminate Federal funding for Amtrak, an action that would inevitably result in the elimination of passenger rail service in this country, is short-sighted at best.

Shutting down Amtrak would force some 20 million Amtrak passengers a year onto our already over-crowded highways and airports. Between New York and Washington alone, Amtrak carries over 2,700—or 23 percent—of the 11,500 daily New York to Washington air and rail passengers. My colleagues who use National Airport can imagine the consequences of an additional 986,000 passengers per year at that facility, and conditions at the New York airports are little better.

Eliminating Amtrak would also work a real hardship on many lower income and elderly Americans who cannot use alternative forms of transportation because of either cost considerations or physical infirmities.

A recent editorial in the Boston Globe makes several additional points in support of saving Amtrak, and I commend them to my colleagues' attention as we prepare to consider the fiscal year 1986 budget.

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 28, 1985]

SAVING AMTRAK

The Amtrak rail passenger system was one of the achievements of the Nixon Administration. Under the leadership of former Massachusetts Gov. John Volpe, who was then Secretary of Transportation, the federal government took over passenger service from the railroads, which had found it a money loser.

The arrangement has worked well. After a difficult transition, Amtrak's employees and managers have cooperated admirably to hold down costs and improve service. Last year the system carried 20 million passengers.

The Reagan Administration proposes to shut down Amtrak to "save" \$684 million in annual subsidies. There would be no savings for some years, since the government would have to pay more than \$2 billion in severance to the 25,000 employees who would lose their jobs, and it would have to write off more than \$3 billion in equipment and other assets.

It is misleading for the Administration to assert that Amtrak competes unfairly with unsubsidized rival forms of transportation. All modes of transportation are subsidized, directly or indirectly. Buses do not pay for the cost of the highways and streets that they travel. The government subsidizes airline by providing air traffic control.

Because air service is so much faster than rail service, Amtrak does not compete with the airlines for business passengers except on very short trips. The much higher price of air travel shows that business travelers would rather save time than money. The ordinary weekday fare between Boston and

New York is \$25 for a five-hour trip on Amtrak compared to \$65 for a 30-minute flight on the Eastern shuttle.

Amtrak, however, does compete with airlines for the business of low-income travelers of families with small children. It also competes with bus companies, which charge slightly less for a slightly faster trip. If it were to be put out of business, the bus lines would be free to raise their fares substantially, and low-income travelers would have no choice.

W. Graham Claytor Jr., the chairman of Amtrak, points out that it is the only form of transportation that could move large numbers of people in a national emergency, and that in many small communities, it is the only transportation. If it were abolished, the United States would be the only industrial nation without a rail passenger system. Claytor has promised to wage a battle to save Amtrak. He deserves public and congressional support.●

#### CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S VIEWS

##### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 13, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S VIEWS

Congress can be criticized for failing to do enough to achieve many important goals, but there is one thing that it always strives to do: represent the American people. It may not lead them, but it does try hard to reflect their opinions. This characteristic of Congress is illustrated by the manner in which Congress has dealt with the role of government in society, one of the fundamental issues of our time.

Widespread disillusionment was the most prominent feature of the public's opinion of government during the 1970s. In the popular mind, Washington's efforts to handle the problems of the day were regarded as ineffective. Government was blamed for inflation and a host of other ills. Such sentiment played a major part in the election of Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, both of whom ran successful anti-government campaigns.

These anti-government feelings tend to be strongest in the abstract. Ask most people, and they will tell you that government, far from being a part of the answer, is part of the problem. Almost everyone would agree that government has become too powerful in certain respects, that spending should be cut, and that regulation must be curtailed. It is safe to say that people today have less faith in government as the means to stimulate the economy and promote the general welfare. They are just less convinced than they were twenty years ago that government is the best instrument for solving economic and social problems. On specific issues, however, the consensus against government weakens. Spending for social security and education, and regulation to protect the environment and public health, have always enjoyed solid support. Even after Mr. Reagan's first term, during which he frequently attacked government, support for many individual programs has remained at an all-time high.

Of course, it is possible to overstate these anti-government feelings. On social policy, Americans tolerate diversity and support personal rights except when there is an overriding concern, as in the case of crime. On economic policy, Americans are suspicious of excessive interference and favor *laissez faire*, but they also approve of the pragmatic use of government power in a variety of circumstances to boost or dampen the economy and solve particular problems.

How have such notions about the role of government been translated into public policy?

**Health Care:** Not long ago the debate in Washington focussed on the expression of government spending for and involvement in health care. Today, policy makers, with an eye on huge budget deficits, want to know how to spend and regulate less. In the 1970s Washington emphasized national health care insurance and the right of health care for every person. Today, health care is viewed as an expensive commodity that might have to be rationed, and there is a growing interest in private competition as a means of driving health care costs down.

**Welfare Reform:** A few years ago welfare reform was high on the national agenda. Several Presidents sent Congress elaborate proposals restructuring welfare. The plan in the 1970s was to replace the patchwork of federal, state, and local welfare initiatives with a guaranteed annual income for the poor. Today, welfare reform is hardly ever mentioned. We do not hear much about a guaranteed annual income, and everyone admits that there are only very limited additional resources to be committed to a resolution of the welfare mess. Whether in the form envisioned in the 1970s or as block grants run by the states, welfare reform has been put on the back burner.

**Energy Policy:** Energy policy was one of the hottest items before Congress in the late 1970s. Presidents talked about "Project Independence" and "the moral equivalent of war." Policy makers wracked their brains trying to figure out what to do to keep the wheels of commerce moving in a world short of oil. Today, however, oil markets are serving us much better, and we have put off for tomorrow any thought about the steps that we will take when the wells run dry. No one believes that the energy crisis was solved; it is just that there is much greater faith that we can produce or conserve our way out of trouble without the help of government. Energy policy is now a topic of discussion only among the experts.

**Education Policy:** National education policy recently has moved away from its traditional preoccupation with the twin goals of equity and quality. It is focussing more on issues of quality, less on issues of equity. Policy makers are not asking which youngsters are being educated, but rather how well youngsters are being educated. Because Americans generally have depended on Washington to concern itself with equity while state and local governments concerned themselves with quality, the shift in focus at the national level means that Washington's role in education is receding.

**Environmental Protection:** When it comes to protecting the environment, public policy seems to be running against the anti-government trend so apparent in other areas. The public is steadfast in support of government's doing more to keep the environment clean. The grossest abuses of an earlier day no longer threaten, progress has been made in removing pollutants from the air, and surface water pollution has abated. None-

theless, people know that more complex problems have emerged. Perhaps the most formidable today is that posed by toxic waste pollution. People want forceful government action to correct the problem, and Congress has responded by trying to strengthen the "Superfund" despite presidential opposition. Washington will look for new ways to protect the environment in the years ahead. Water quality and availability are sure to be major challenges.

I would say that Congress in recent decades has pushed government in the general direction desired by the public. Expanding government activity in the 1950s and 1960s was followed by retrenchment in the 1970s and 1980s. Whatever Congress's shortcomings, it has represented the people in these broad movements of public policy.●

MSGR. JOHN PATRICK CARROLL-ABBING

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the accomplishments of Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing. Monsignor Carroll-Abbing is the president and founder of Boys' Town in Rome, Italy, which this year is celebrating its 40th anniversary.

Because of his long record of accomplishments in the area of child welfare, I'm sure his achievements will be of interest to this body.

Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing was recently selected as the recipient of the Foreign Press Association's first World Humanitarian Award. The award, presented by the 400-member organization representing foreign correspondents based in the United States, is given to single out an individual whose deeds and words have had a major impact in the field of human rights and service to humanity. In announcing their selection, the Foreign Press Association stated that Monsignor Carroll-Abbing fulfills these criteria to the highest degree.

The monsignor has had a long career of service to humanity and children in particular. A native of Dublin, Ireland, he began his service to the Vatican in 1938. He first distinguished himself for his work on behalf of the persecuted during World War II. Under the Nazi occupation he became a leader in the resistance movement and was decorated on the day of liberation with the Silver Medal for Military Valor on the Field of Battle. The King of Italy made him a grand officer in the Order of Saints Maurice and Lazarus and a grand officer in the Order of the Crown of Italy. He was also awarded the Grand Cross, the highest decoration conferred by the Order of Malta.

After the war, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing asked Pope Pius XII for per-

mission to dedicate himself exclusively to the service of homeless children. In August 1945, he founded his first Children's Village, which later became known as Boys' Town of Italy. Today there are nine Boys' Communities and one Girls' Town on five continents. Violence, hunger, and abandonment is a simple one: love, respect, and trust. Educators from all over the world have marveled at the way in which youngsters between the ages of 10 and 19, accept the responsibilities of organizing and running their own community life.

In the words of the monsignor himself:

Everyone today speaks of the need for training young people in responsibility. How can this be done by giving them actual concrete responsibilities, with all that this involves, the possibility of making mistakes.

Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's activities have not been limited simply to Boys' Towns. He has headed disaster relief programs and peace missions to war-torn countries. He has earned worldwide recognition for his understanding of the problems of violence, drugs, spiritual and moral disorientation that afflict so many young people today and as a courageous spokesman on their behalf.

Over the past 40 years, the monsignor's travels on behalf of children have taken him to many troubled parts of the globe. His lifelong mission for young people has led him to India, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Southeast Asia, the Philippines, Africa, South America and most recently, Lebanon.

Monsignor Carroll-Abbing is also the founder of an International Study Center on Teenage Problems. Founded in the early 1960's, the center has studied the causes and effects of youthful unrest all over the world.

Recently, a peace monument in the monsignor's honor was dedicated at Boys' Town of Rome by Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, Secretary of State to Pope John Paul II. Cardinal Casaroli hailed him for 40 years of unbelievable sacrifices, of unremitting toil, but an incredible harvest of love. It has also led to unrestrained optimism for the future on Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's part. "Never have I seen greater potentialities in youth than in the teenagers of today."●

#### COMPASSIONATE PAIN RELIEF ACT

**HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Mr. HUGHES and 20 of our colleagues, I am pleased to introduce H.R. 1597, the "Compassionate Pain Relief Act."

The legislation requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a temporary, 4-year research program through which the drug heroin would be made available for the treatment of terminally ill cancer patients suffering intractable pain. The drug would be provided through a limited number of hospital pharmacies upon the written prescription of a licensed physician. The program is limited in scope and will require individual registration of participating hospitals and physicians.

Each year the Federal Government seizes hundreds of pounds of heroin illegally smuggled into this country. This legislation would permit the Secretary to use a small portion of this contraband for a compassionate and humane program.

Heroin has a negative connotation in this country—and it should. It has wreaked havoc upon our cities and has cost the lives of thousands of our young people. I know this to be true. The Subcommittee on Health and the Environment has created programs providing billions in Federal aid to assist in the treatment and rehabilitation of these drug abuse victims.

H.R. 1597 has nothing to do with heroin the street drug. It has everything to do with the treatment of intractable pain. It has everything to do with assuring that nothing is held back from physicians which might aid them in relieving the suffering of their dying patients.

The American Cancer Society estimates that over 800,000 Americans will die of cancer this year. Cancer is the second leading cause of death and the illness most feared by the public.

As many as 50 percent of cancer patients will experience severe, intractable pain during the course of their illness—often during the last days and weeks of life. For many the pain of cancer is so severe, and their physical condition so deteriorated, that powerful narcotic painkillers must be administered by injection.

Heroin is one of the most powerful painkillers known to medical science. In testimony before our subcommittee there was unanimous consensus that heroin was a safe and effective medication for the treatment of severe pain. In fact, former Assistant Secretary for Health Edward N. Brandt wrote in the August 23 issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine* that "there is no dispute over heroin's ability to help control pain."

Research at the Georgetown Medical Center, funded by the National Cancer Institute, concluded that heroin is highly effective in the control of cancer pain and no more addicting than other painkillers like morphine or dilaudid. This research revealed that heroin is 2½ times more potent than morphine.

While not legally available in the United States, heroin is widely used in England in the treatment of cancer pain. The British Home Office has informed the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment that the use of heroin in the treatment of pain has grown significantly in recent years.

U.S. policy toward heroin developed in the 1920's when Congress prohibited its use in medicine. It was thought that the drug was more addicting than other painkillers and that its availability in medicine was the cause of street abuse. Today we know prohibiting heroin's therapeutic use has had little effect on the incidence of abuse. Yet these restrictions have impacted harshly upon those cancer patients who might benefit from the use of heroin in the treatment of intractable pain.

Several additional points should be made about this legislation.

First, H.R. 1597 would not legalize heroin. Distribution or possession of heroin outside the limited, carefully controlled scope of this program would continue to constitute a violation of the Federal Controlled Substances Act. Violators would be subject to maximum penalties of 15 years imprisonment and a \$250,000 fine.

Second, heroin provided through this program will be available in only a limited number of hospitals and only if the hospital requests to participate in the program. Individual hospitals, physicians, or patients are not required to participate. Participation is strictly voluntary.

Third, physicians would only be permitted to prescribe heroin if conventional analgesics had been tried and were found to be ineffective in relieving a patient's pain.

Fourth, stringent safeguards have been built into this program. A series of provisions have been included that prevent the possibility of illegal diversion. Oral dosages are prohibited. The drug is prohibited from being dispensed through retail or community pharmacies. Participating hospitals and physicians must be registered with the Food and Drug Administration. The General Accounting Office is charged with monitoring administration of the program. The program sunsets at the end of 4 years.

Fifth, no one should assume that heroin is a wonder drug or that passage of H.R. 1597 will eliminate very real deficiencies that exist in clinical knowledge about pain management. Drugs like morphine or dilaudid may be the analgesic of choice for most cancer patients. Yet for a few—perhaps only one out of a thousand—heroin may offer benefits not available with conventional medications.

A basic but little understood fact of medicine is that patients respond differently to medications. We encourage

the availability of a variety of medications to permit physicians to tailor a course of treatment which is most effective in a given patient.

Finally, there is nothing unprecedented about the program established by this bill. Provisions were included to assure the active involvement of the Food and Drug Administration in assuring the safety and effectiveness of the drug's formulation. In fact, the legislation is modeled after an existing Federal program which provides therapeutic dosages of THC—the active ingredient of marijuana—to physicians for prescription to cancer patients suffering nausea due to chemotherapy. The purity of THC is carefully controlled and its distribution is limited to a small number of hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, last year a similar version of this legislation was defeated in the House. I believe the prospects for enacting the legislation this year have improved.

There is broad bipartisan support for the legislation. There is greater awareness on the part of Members that the legislation is a temporary measure carefully limited in scope to the treatment of intractable pain due to terminal cancer.

In addition, legitimate concerns over the effect of the legislation on law enforcement activities have been addressed. In this regard I want to express my personal thanks to Representative BILL HUGHES of New Jersey, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, for assisting in the drafting of this new bill and for joining as the principal cosponsor of this legislation. Chairman HUGHES' support is clear evidence of his sensitivity and compassion for terminally ill patients and their families.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO FATHER FRANCIS DOBRYDNIU

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call attention to a member of our community who has selflessly given of himself for the good of the unfortunate in the world. Father Francis Dobrydniu has served his community for more than 40 years and after all this time, he still has within him the desire to do more.

Father Dobrydniu travelled this year at his own expense to Calcutta, to meet Mother Teresa, "The Saint of the Slums." There, he not only shared in her compassion and caring, he also made a most generous contribution to her vital work for the poor. Father Dobrydniu's donation of \$20,000 is an example of concern for the less fortunate that epitomizes many in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the spirit and commitment shown by Father Dobrydniu, and I commend his deeds to the attention of my colleagues and their constituents. I would like to call your attention to an article which appeared in the Hazleton Standard-Speaker which explains in greater detail the accomplishments of this generous man.

#### A PRIEST'S ODYSSEY

\$20,000 GIFT TO MOTHER TERESA LEAVES HAZLETON CLERIC RICHER

(By Ed Conrad)

The Rev. Francis A. Dobrydniu proudly used to boast of two unforgettable events in his life: the day he was ordained a priest and the day he was in Vatican City for the coronation of Pope John Paul II, the first Polish pontiff.

Now he has a third.

Dobrydniu recently returned from Calcutta, India, where he spent five days in close company with Mother Teresa, known affectionately as "The Saint of the Slums" and the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for her lifelong efforts on behalf of the destitute and downtrodden.

While there, Rev. Dobrydniu contributed \$20,000—from his matured term life insurance policy—to Mother Teresa to use as she sees fit to continue her labor of love for all mankind.

"I came back from Calcutta the richest poor man in the world," he said. "I'm grateful to God for giving me the opportunity to meet her and spend so many hours at her side."

That he did has to rank as one of the greatest pleasures of his entire life for the 69-year-old Hazleton native, who has been a priest for 41 years and currently serves as pastor of St. Stanislaus R.C. Church.

"I have always mentioned during my sermons in church that there are two persons I most admire on this earth," he said. "One is the Holy Father and the other is Mother Teresa."

He explained that he has long admired Pope John Paul II because "of the work he does in unifying the church" and that he has long admired Mother Teresa "because of her unselfish devotion to her fellow man."

He said when he learned Karol Wojtyla had been elected pontiff by the College of Cardinals in 1978, he felt at first it could not possibly be true. But, later, when he knew it had actually happened, he said he immediately realized the significance of his election to head the worldwide Roman Catholic church.

"After all, he not only was the first Pole ever elected Pope," said Dobrydniu, whose parish is largely Polish. "But he also broke a 400-year tradition of having Italians elected Pope. It was an occasion of (significant) historical fact."

This explains why he immediately phoned a local travel agency and made arrangements to fly to Rome. And, when he arrived in Vatican City with the specific purpose of just standing in the crowd in St. Peter's Square to see the pontiff from a distance, one thing led to another and he wound up attending the pope's first Mass inside St. Peter's Cathedral.

Then, against high odds, he was given the opportunity to sit among ambassadors during a reception afterward. He had a chance to kiss the pope's ring, chat momentarily with the new pontiff and inform

him—in Polish—that he had come all the way from America for the occasion.

The visit with Mother Teresa, 74, shared an almost similar beginning.

Dobrydniu said that, although he has long admired the founder of the order of nuns known as "The Missionaries of Christian Charity," for some strange reason Mother Teresa and her cause suddenly occupied a great deal of his thoughts during the month of December.

Finally the cleric made a decision to fly to Calcutta with the hope of meeting her.

A few weeks ago he made the 10,000-mile trip which took 18 hours by air: From the United States to Frankfurt, Germany; to Saudi Arabia; to Bombay, India; and, finally, the final leg to Calcutta, where Mother Teresa had started her sisterhood and still calls "home."

But, even while airborne, Dobrydniu had doubts whether he would even get the opportunity to meet with her. He had learned she was in Ethiopia where she and members of her religious order had set up facilities for feeding 10,000 starving people and tending to their medical needs as best they could.

"After I got settled in the hotel, I went down to the lobby and asked one of the hotel employees if they could help me find a certain person," Father Dobrydniu recalled. "I was asked: 'Who?'"

"That's when I mentioned Mother Teresa's name, and I was told I should make some telephone calls to (the eight or nine) homes of the Missionaries of Christian Charity."

"I phoned the first one and explained that I was a priest from America and wanted to meet with Mother Teresa. I was told I should call a different number (the home where she normally would be residing)."

Father Dobrydniu called the second number and, after explaining his situation, received information that sort of left him breathless. He was told that Mother Teresa was indeed in Ethiopia.

"At that moment, I was thinking: 'I've just traveled 10,000 miles and I won't even be able to see her.'"

But a nun on the other end of the line offered some encouraging news.

"She told me that she understood that Mother Teresa may be returning from Ethiopia either today or tomorrow," said Dobrydniu, who recalled that his pessimism had vanished.

He said he then asked if it were possible for him to go there the next morning and celebrate Mass.

The nun said it indeed would be possible, and she gave him the address.

Dobrydniu arrived at the charity home before the sunrise the next morning and soon found himself celebrating Mass in front of approximately 400 nuns.

During his brief sermon, he explained who he was, where he was from and what the purpose of his visit was: To meet Mother Teresa, whom he greatly admires.

"Actually, during the Homily, I mentioned that there are three big events in my life: (1) Celebrating my first Mass as a newly ordained priest; (2) Being present for Pope John Paul II's first Mass; and (3) Seeing Mother Teresa."

"Of course, I quickly added that the first two events already had happened, and it was only the third that hadn't. I expressed regrets that, perhaps, I would never get the opportunity to meet the founder of their order."

"With that," Father Dobrydnio remembered, "there was the sound of laughter in the church. It seemed as though every one of the 400 nuns—more nuns than I have ever seen at one place in my entire life—all had something they were chuckling over—and I didn't know why."

Dobrydnio returned to the altar and continued with the celebration of the Mass until it was time for him to distribute Holy Communion.

He said he noticed that almost every nun in the church—of all colors—had risen to walk in orderly fashion to the front of the church to receive the sacrament from the American visitor.

"As I looked out, I saw that the vast majority were young and vibrant," he said. "But then I realized that the very first nun in line—a very tiny woman—was a lot older than the rest."

"He admitted putting two and two together and wondering: 'Uh, oh.'" He had a strange feeling that this particular nun was someone very special.

"When she arrived to receive Holy Communion, I bent my head a bit and whispered: 'Are you who I think you are? Are you Mother Teresa?' the nun smiled and answered, 'Yes!'"

That was the humble beginning of their relationship which grew and grew over the next five years.

After Mass, Father Dobrydnio formally met Mother Teresa and he says he will never forget that she carried his breakfast to his table. It was the start of a beautiful friendship.

As the days passed, Mother Teresa discussed her mission in life with the Hazleton priest and even took him along as she visited various homes throughout the bast and improverished city. He was at her side as she helped feed unwanted babies, as she helped administer medicine to the sick and crippled, as she offered words of hope to those who, not too long previously, had lost all hope.

Dobrydnio said, no matter which facility they were in, a large sign on a war in each room reminded the Missionaries of Christian Charity of their sole objective for being a part of the order:

**"TOUCH THE DYING"**

"Mother Teresa told me that the worst kind of death is not from cancer and is not from tuberculosis," said Father Dobrydnio. "She told me the worst possible kind of death is dying unwanted and unloved."

"She explained that this is one of their main concerns: That nobody (in their care) dies unwanted or unloved."

"She told me they must be touched. They must be held. They have to feel that someone loves them."

Dobrydnio then recounted a bit of Mother Teresa's most remarkable story following her arrival in India from Albania, her native land, as a teacher. She hadn't been in the world most populous country very long before she realized the monumental work that had to be done for the poor and destitute because terrible poverty and widespread disease surrounded her on all sides.

He said she soon realized, simply by walking around the city, that the vast majority of people were so poor that they didn't even have roofs over their heads. Their entire lives were spent in the filthy streets.

Dobrydnio said disease was rampant because of the absence of proper sewage facilities.

"If they weren't dying from sickness, some were dying after being attacked by rats," he said.

Eventually, Mother Teresa established the Missionaries of Christian Charity and their work has spread like wildfire throughout the poorer nations of the world. Members of the order are now laboring in 67 different countries.

The noble charity work of Mother Teresa and her nuns has not gone unnoticed. Normally, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize goes to a diplomat who may have contributed a giant stride toward peace in a given year.

But, back in 1979, the Norwegian selection committee shocked the world by awarding the coveted award to Mother Teresa on behalf of her most wonderful labor on behalf of the downtrodden of the world.

She also received numerous other distinguished awards for her charity work, including the Albert Schweitzer Award, the Kennedy Prize, the Good Samaritan Award, a United Nations award and, perhaps best of all to size up the scope of her compassion, the Nehru Award.

The Nehru Award had always been presented to a native of India but those who decide on the recipient were in awe of Mother Teresa's lengthy crusade and made her a special exception by honoring her with the prestigious prize.

However, an incident which occurred in Stockholm when she received the Nobel Prize is worth retelling more than anything else which occurred at any of the other award presentations.

On Dec. 10, 1979, Mother Teresa, wearing her \$1 cotton dress, stood before the Swedish king in a hall filled with diplomats and received the prize.

In her acceptance speech, she said "the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion."

"You fight abortion by adoption," she added, "Doing it that way, you save thousands of lives."

After the ceremony, one of the diplomats present told her a lot of people present at the ceremony did not appreciate what she had said about abortion.

Mother Teresa simply pointed to the inscription on the Nobel Prize (a plaque) she had just been given and replied: "They gave me this prize because of what I do . . . I SAVE lives."

Because of this incident, Mother Teresa told Dobrydnio, she promised to never again appear at any ceremony honoring her or her work.

Perhaps the highlight of the entire trip was the contribution which Dobrydnio made to Mother Teresa and the Missionaries of Christian Charity.

"When I was ordained in 1943, I had purchased an insurance policy and it had matured," he explained. "When it did, I had the money set aside and I vowed that I would use it someday to help someone in need."

"This was the place: Calcutta. This was the person: Mother Teresa. This was the work: helping those in dire need," he explained.

Dobrydnio, near the end of his five-day stay in Calcutta, aroused Mother Teresa's curiosity when he called her aside and told her he had something to give her.

"When she looked at the amount on the check—\$20,000—she actually shed tears of joy," he recalled. She looked at me and said: "Do you realize how much food this will buy for the babies and how much medicine it will buy for the sick?"

Father Dobrydnio smiled and told her there was only one "catch" to his donation.

He said he would like if she would endorse it right in front of him. She promptly obliged.

"I'm expecting that cancelled check back any day now," he said.

Father Dobrydnio explained that, because it will bear her signature since she had signed it in his presence, it will become a treasured memento of his truly unforgettable visit with "The Saint of the Slums".

**FIRST THINGS FIRST CREDIT ACT OF 1985**

**HON. BYRON L. DORGAN**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the First Things First Credit Act of 1985, which I am introducing today, would amend the Internal Revenue Code to deny any deduction for interest paid or incurred on loans in connection with certain corporate takeovers or acquisitions. I believe this measure is necessary because large U.S. corporations are cornering billions of dollars of our Nation's scare credit to finance their takeover schemes.

Last year Chevron Corp. borrowed \$12 billion to acquire Gulf Oil. Chevron is paying \$20 million a month interest on that debt. I wonder whether any corporation would be as willing to pay that enormous amount of interest if our Tax Code did not allow it to write off the interest expense against its revenues when calculating taxable corporate income. Also, is this a productive use of scarce credit? Does it create new wealth and new jobs? I don't think so.

I think our corporate income tax laws have motivated much of the takeover epidemic affecting corporations today. And, according to an article in the Washington Post on January 13, 1985, merger experts expect the torrid pace of takeover activity to continue in 1985. Some 45 mergers, each worth more than \$1 billion, have taken place since 1981, compared with only a dozen in the 12 previous years combined and, during the first 9 months of last year, the value of reported mergers totaled \$103.2 billion, almost twice the \$53.3 billion value of mergers reported in the first 9 months of 1983 and \$20.6 billion more than the old record for an entire year set in 1981.

I am not trying to prevent corporate takeovers. But, I object to having the American taxpayer finance these corporate schemes through interest deductions for takeover sprees. And, I am concerned that credit, which might otherwise be available for loans to farmers, small businesses, home buyers, and others is being guzzled up by large corporations to finance these takeovers.

My bill will deny the interest deduction only to those corporations with gross receipts of \$250 million in the taxable year preceding the year in which the merger or tender for merger occurs. In that way, mergers between smaller companies, for which there might be defensible business reasons, will not be penalized. However, for America's largest corporations eager to become even larger through takeovers, my bill's message is they can pay for their takeover activities themselves with no help from Uncle Sam.

I believe this bill will slow down the torrid pace of corporate takeover activity. It will make more credit available for our farmers and small businesses. It will help to stop the drain of capital away from productive investment. It will help American business keep its mind on productivity rather than on tax deductions.●

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, America has often been called a nation of many nations. But in the rush of daily life, we often overlook the fact that our national identity is, in fact, a composite of contributions from virtually every nationality and ethnic group in the world.

On St. Patrick's Day, March 17, Americans of all backgrounds become honorary Irish. It is a day, indeed, to come together to celebrate the unique spirit of the Irish, whose proud participation in American life has immeasurably enriched the civic, social, cultural, and commercial institutions of our Nation.

In this spirit, I am honored to join with thousands of New Jersey residents on Sunday, March 17, for the historic 50th anniversary of the Newark St. Patrick's Day Parade. The parade, coordinated as in previous years by the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee of Newark, is the oldest and largest in the State. The grand marshal of the parade will be Peter J. Smith. Ann White will be deputy grand marshal. Serving as the general chairman of Newark's St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee is Thomas P. Giblin. Seventy-five organizations have pledged their participation.

Events like this do not come about because of the luck of the Irish. They take hard work and many hours of commitment. Among the dedicated officers of the parade committee who have organized this event are Rose Riley and J. Brendan Vesey, both vice chairs of the parade committee, James McCarty, Helen M. Washington, John Kenny, Gerald Lenihan,

Terrence O'Reilly, Mary Vesey, Edward Glen, Paul Hopkins, James Hunter, Michael Miggins, Ann White, Thomas McCormack, Eugene Byrne, Michael Farrell, Denis Lenihan, the committee's historian, and Rev. Msgr. John J. Maloney, the chaplain. Many other members of the committee contributed valuable time and energy.

The Newark St. Patrick's Day Parade, like the many other parades and activities taking place throughout the Nation, offers us all an opportunity to recognize the special way that citizens of Irish heritage have contributed to our country.

In many ways, the Irish experience in America has been synonymous with our Nation's growth and development. The Kennedy family galvanized American politics. George Meany exemplified American labor. Eugene O'Neill shaped American drama. George M. Cohan enlivened Broadway. And Louis Sullivan pioneered America's architectural tradition.

Like many other immigrant groups, the Irish came to America seeking opportunity and fleeing misfortune. In the 19th century, many Irish immigrants toiled hard building the railroads that linked the coasts of our growing land. Others worked the mines and factories. And they often had to fight nativist mobs that brandished anti-Irish, anti-Catholic slogans.

But these early Irish-Americans prevailed because of their faith in the American dream, and the strength of conviction, love of liberty, and spiritual resourcefulness that they brought with them from the Emerald Island.

As the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick has become a symbol of the Irish people—and for good reason. For his message was one of peace and justice, of faith and religion, of learning and commitment. When he arrived as a Christian missionary on the shores of Ireland over 1,500 years ago, he inspired a deep spiritual reverence in the people that can still be seen in the churches he built and the arts and letters that, to this day, continue to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember on this St. Patrick's Day that St. Patrick is revered by all the Irish people, regardless of creed or religion. Sadly, however, areas of St. Patrick's beloved Ireland are suffering from a protracted, heartbreaking conflict. So as we celebrate St. Patrick's Day, let us also hope for the restoration of peace, brotherhood and justice to the people of Ireland. This would be a fitting tribute to the memory of Ireland's patron saint.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MAMA HOWARD OF BERKELEY, CA

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer on this day of March 19, 1985, this statement in tribute to Mrs. Mable D. Howard.

Mrs. Mable D. Howard is 80 years young and has become a legend in her own time. She is the mother of 10 children and is affectionately called Mama Howard by thousands of bay area residents.

Mama, a Berkeley resident, was born in Bay City, TX, on February 3, 1905. She has been a stalwart in bay area politics for over 40 years.

Mama has worked to help many of her favorite political candidates obtain office. She has also fought for issues and causes in which she believes. In the late 1960's Mama Howard was successful in her instigation of plans to have the BART system put underground in South Berkeley. She was quoted in the Oakland Post as saying:

I would not stand by and allow them to uproot the Black neighborhood, destroy homes, displace families, create excess noise and destroy the beauty of our community; I got to work.

She has been active in other community activities including:

The Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley.

The Harriet Tubman Club.

The Board of Directors of Economic Opportunity.

Organization of Berkeley.

The Target Area Council of the Edith M. Austin Skills Center.

Board of Directors of Model Cities.

Board of Directors of Senior Citizens of Berkeley.

South Berkeley Development Council.

1948 Blue Ribbon Committee of Berkeley.

ILWU Local 10 Widows Auxiliary.

Mama Howard has received many honors and awards. She has been chosen Mother of the Year several times and has been considered as "Mother" to many San Quentin and Folsom inmates. As a member of the Church of God in Christ, she not only visited the inmates, but also counseled and prayed with them even on death row. In addition, she received an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letter Award from the Center for Urban Black Studies, the National Volunteers Award in 1972, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Certificate of Honor Award in appreciation of public recognition of distinction and merit, the BWOPA's Ella Hill Hutch Award for outstanding political leadership and service, and many more.

Mama once said:

The best that we can do with our lives is share it with others and as long as I have breath in my body to help those who need it, I shall find myself doing so. I feel such a burden for my people that if I could, I would put my arms around the whole world to make sure that they all should know the warm joy of being loved and cared for.●

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT C. WETHERELL, JR.

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MADIGAN and I understand that Robert C. Wetherell, Jr., who has served with great distinction as FDA's Associate Commissioner for Legislation and Information, plans to leave his post soon to become head of FDA's Northeast Shellfish Technical Unit in Rhode Island. All of us in Congress who have had the pleasure to deal with Bob Wetherell over the years will miss him very much.

A thorough professional who always took a bipartisan approach in his relations with Congress, Mr. Wetherell has served as FDA's chief legislative officer for the last 16 years. In 1969, he became Deputy Director, Office of Legislative Services, and in 1974 was appointed Director of that office. In 1978, he was promoted to Associate Commissioner for Legislative Affairs, and in 1982 to the much larger job of Associate Commissioner for Legislation and Information.

Mr. Wetherell has received a number of major awards for his excellent service at FDA. In 1975, he received the FDA Commendable Service Award for sustained and devoted service to the Food and Drug Administration through his many contributions to the Office of Legislative Services. In 1983, he received the FDA Award of Merit for extraordinary effectiveness and leadership in directing, developing, and coordinating the agency's legislative liaison and public information activities, and in 1984, the Public Health Service presented him with a Superior Service Award for exemplary skill and leadership in directing, executing, and coordinating both FDA's legislative liaison and public information activities.

On behalf of Mr. MADIGAN and myself and the many Members and staff of the House of Representatives who have worked with Bob Wetherell over the years, we want to extend our best wishes for his continued success.●

QUESTIONS FOR EGYPTIAN PRESIDENT MUBARAK

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak, visited our country last week. The recent contacts and the flurry of messengers between Cairo and Jerusalem in past weeks created a favorable atmosphere for the visit.

In an analytical and perceptive article, Charles Krauthammer cuts through the smokescreen of rhetoric surrounding the current peace initiative in the Middle East. I commend to my colleagues Krauthammer's perceptive article published in the Washington Post on March 8, on the eve of Mr. Mubarak's visit.

(By Charles Krauthammer)

FOUR QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT MUBARAK

In the last few weeks, Egypt has been all diplomatic motion, sending secret envoys to Israel and throwing up a variety of peace proposals. Israeli officials, starved for any hint of warmth from Egypt, are required to give any Egyptian gesture the benefit of the doubt. Americans, who are not so desperate, need not be so diplomatic. As partners to Camp David, they have a right to ask questions. The first is: Could there be a connection between this sudden peace offensive and President Mubarak's arrival tomorrow in Washington?

Mubarak comes to Washington to ask for \$3.15 billion, plus forgiveness of unpaid interest on Egypt's \$4.5 billion military debt. But he will have to mollify Congress, which is in no mood to grant him the money. That is because American largess was our part of the deal at Camp David. For its part, Egypt promised the United States two things: strategic cooperation with the United States and normal relations with Israel.

Congress will ask Question 2: What has happened to strategic cooperation? Its symbol was to be the Ras Banas naval base in southeastern Egypt. Sadat had promised President Carter military facilities at Ras Banas. The United States envisioned it as a staging ground for the Rapid Deployment Force. Mubarak scrapped the whole project. The reason is not sinister. Mubarak simply does not want to be closely associated with the United States, both for domestic and Third World reasons. As Prime Minister Kamal Hassan Ali once said, "We take weapons from the United States, but we are not aligned to the United States." How non-aligned? The United States asked Egypt to allow a Voice of America transmitter on its soil. Mubarak said no even to that. (It will be placed in Israel instead). Fair enough. Egypt is, as we say here, a free country. But if no quid, why our \$3 billion quo?

The other half of the Camp David bargain was to be this: Israel gives up Sinai, a buffer zone three times its own size and its only source of oil; Egypt gives normal relations (the verb is strange, but so is the deal) and sends an ambassador to Tel Aviv. Question 3: How are relations and where is the ambassador?

Answer: The ambassador was recalled to Egypt over two years ago, and cultural, commercial and scientific agreements are nearly

frozen. As Butros Ghali, Egypt's minister of state for foreign affairs, put it, relations are in a state of "cold peace."

Now, when the United States sponsored Camp David, it did not press Israel to give up all of Sinai for non-belligerency. Israel already has non-belligerency. That was guaranteed not only by the Sinai II disengagement accord of 1975, but by the preponderance of Israel's deterrent power. Israel gave up Sinai for normal relations. Not for the material benefits such relations would bring—they are hardly worth a tenth of the lost oil revenues alone—but because the example of open, routine commerce between Egyptian and Jew might persuade other Arabs to seek coexistence with Israel.

Egypt blames cold peace on the Lebanon war. However convenient an excuse that may once have been—in fact, the freezing of relations began long before Lebanon and accelerated with the Sadat assassination—it rings false now. Israel, under a Labor Prime Minister, is leaving Lebanon. (Likud committed Israel to withdrawing as far back as May 1983, in the treaty negotiated by Secretary of State George Shultz.) Furthermore, Shimon Peres is open to compromise on the West Bank, another "warming" condition recently created by Mubarak.

Well, says Egypt, Israel is still illegally holding Taba. Taba is a dot on the map. In fact, it is in dispute because, when the map was drawn in 1906, the lines were drawn in pencil. All of Taba lies under the width of the pencil mark! Suppose Taba did belong to Egypt. Israel gave up 61,000 square kilometers in Sinai. Taba is less than one.

For returning 99.99 percent of the land, what has Israel gotten? Israel has an embassy in Cairo with an Israeli flag flying over it. But the Israeli mission is totally ostracized by Egyptian society. The ghettoized Israeli Embassy in Cairo mirrors precisely the position of the Israeli state in the larger Arab world: an alien presence in quarantine. If that is what Israel gets for Camp David, then, in fairness, it should have given up Taba and kept the rest of Sinai.

We are now in the midst of a mini peace enthusiasm. The Mubarak peace offensive, however, is unusually empty, even by Middle East standards. Next week he will ask the United States to start a "peace process" by negotiating with a Jordanian-PLO delegation. This is a transparent attempt to get the United States to deal with the PLO, without the PLO's renouncing terror and recognizing Israel (America's longstanding condition for such talks). It is also a way to get Hussein off the hook of direct talks with Israel.

If the "process" is nothing more than maneuver, what of the "peace"? The peace everyone will be talking about next week is ultimately to be brought about, all will agree, by the "land for peace" formula. Well, land for peace is not just theory. It now has a history. That history—Camp David—suggests a final question, not only for Mubarak but for others eager to press Israel into new and riskier concessions: We can all see the land. Mubarak has Sinai. Where is the peace?●

"IRISHMAN OF THE YEAR:"  
JUDGE EDWARD J. BLAKE

**HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Edward J. Blake, who will be named "Irishman of the Year" by the Irish Society of Philadelphia at their annual banquet on March 30, 1985.

Mr. Blake is in his 14th year of distinguished service as a judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. He is a lifelong Philadelphian, a graduate of St. Joseph's University and the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Before he came to the bench, he served capably as a court administrator. He has been a leader in his community, tirelessly assisting charities and schools.

The Irish Society of Philadelphia has appropriately chosen to honor Judge Blake. I am happy to be able to join with them in honoring him for his renowned career of service to our city. ●

ST. FRANCIS RESIDENCE HONORED FOR AIDING THE HOMELESS

**HON. BILL GREEN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the plight of the homeless, particularly the homeless mentally ill, has been of deep concern to all. In the 98th Congress we sought and secured funding to help meet the immediate shelter needs of this population, and in recent weeks we have been reminded—both because of the cold weather and because of increasing activity here in Congress and in the media—that our efforts must continue.

In New York City, the Franciscan priests have ministered to scores of destitute and homeless people since the stock market crashed in 1929. During the Depression, more than 5,000 people a day queued up to receive sandwiches and coffee from the St. Francis breadline. Their efforts have continued to this day, and their work has not gone unnoticed. In October 1984, the program was conferred a certificate of significant achievement from the American Psychiatric Association, a medical specialty society which represents more than 30,000 physicians nationwide.

The award was conferred by the association to the St. Francis Residence in New York City, at the recommendation of the hospital and community psychiatry achievement awards board,

a panel of leading psychiatrists in the Nation.

The St. Francis Residence was selected from among 134 applicants for this high honor, and their work can serve as a model of what can be done to meet not only the housing needs but the health and social support needs of the deinstitutionalized mentally ill who are at risk of becoming among the Nation's homeless.

Until 1979, the Franciscans coordinated a program of psychosocial services for the deinstitutionalized mental patients living in a single room occupancy [SRO] hotel in Manhattan. Their supportive program was intended to prevent mental and physical deterioration by penetrating the chronic patients' isolation and cultivating a sense of community.

In 1979, however, the hotel was sold, and the new owners announced their intent to alter the use of the site. The occupants of the SRO might have found themselves back on the streets or in the State hospital, had not the Franciscans decided to end the cycle of displacement.

After forming the St. Francis Friends of the Poor, Inc., during the summer of 1980, the Franciscans bought the Beechwood, another SRO hotel capable of housing 104 people. Complete renovation was undertaken. Then, closely monitored by the St. Francis staff, the residents made a smooth transition to their new residence. The St. Francis Friends of the Poor describe their mission as the provision of "safe, permanent, and dignified housing to individuals with severe psychiatric disabilities who have experienced years of personal and institutional neglect."

Thus, the St. Francis Residence differs from other SRO's because its managers are concerned not only with building maintenance but with the tenants' quality of life. Staff members help the tenants to budget, negotiate with welfare and Social Security offices, and keep medical appointments. They also encourage the tenants to shop for those who are ill, visit hospitalized tenants, celebrate birthdays, and be cognizant of each others' problems. When a tenant's mental condition becomes exacerbated, he or she is accompanied by a St. Francis staff member to the hospital.

The St. Francis staff has achieved continuity of care in a community-based residence by offering tenants the security of a permanent home with consistent services provided by a variety of agencies. Despite the number of tenants who have serious mental illness or substance abuse problems, only six required psychiatric hospitalization between June 1982 and June 1983. According to the St. Francis staff, this relapse rate is quite low compared with that of other SRO hotels.

The St. Francis Friends of the Poor have recently opened a second residence for the homeless mentally ill and are raising funds to purchase and rehabilitate a third facility. After their success with the St. Francis Residence, the priests feel compelled to provide more housing with supportive services to meet what they call a "seemingly endless need."

I commend that St. Francis Residence to my colleagues. It is an example of what can be done to help meet the needs of the chronically mentally ill who are at risk of "falling-through-the-cracks" of the deinstitutionalization movement and—who without organized programs providing a comprehensive system of care—of becoming a national homeless statistic. ●

THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PETER'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN PERTH AMBOY, NJ

**HON. BERNARD J. DWYER**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a moment of great historical significance: The 300th anniversary of St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Perth Amboy, NJ. This oldest Episcopal church in the New Jersey Diocese held its first service in 1685, and has since amassed a history rich in accomplishment.

St. Peter's churchyard is a national historical site and is the burial place of many noted figures in our history: artist William Dunlap, whose portrait of George Washington hangs in the Capitol; Thomas Peterson, the first black voter in America under the 15th amendment; Vittorio Ciani, and Italian-American sculptor knighted by the Italian Government and whose sculpture also appears in the U.S. Capitol; and the founder of the New Jersey Medical Society, Robert McKeon, whose brother signed the Declaration of Independence.

The St. Peter's Church bell dates back to 1789. It was cast in England and presented as a gift by Capt. Philip Lytheby after the original bell was damaged beyond repair in the Revolutionary War. There is also the monument to the Mayflower Pact.

Perth Amboy was made the colonial capital in 1786, and several of the Royal Governors lived there and were members of St. Peter's parish. In the Revolutionary War, St. Peter's Church and churchyard were occupied in turn by the American and British Armies, and many of the parishioners were strong supporters of the American cause.

St. Peter's Church is also noted for its stained glass windows, six of which were made in London. The upper panel of each window depicts an incident in the life of the church's patron Saint, Peter, the Apostle, and the lower panel shows the history of the church in colonial times. The church is also the proud owner of an original set of Queen Anne communion silver.

The church stands tall today, continuing the traditions of 300 years of service, commitment, vision, and faith. St. Peter's has made an incalculable contribution to our community and State.

Over these past 300 years, the church and the many who have worked and worshiped there have been generous and dedicated citizens, making contributions that are manifold.

We have all been graced by the enduring presence of St. Peter's Episcopal Church and wish its parishioners and clergy, alike, our sincerest congratulations upon reaching this most rare and significant benchmark in the life of your church.●

WINGO WEEK

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, March 4 through March 10 was proclaimed "Wingo Week" in the city of Boston by Mayor Raymond Flynn.

Wingo is the Boston Herald's daily lucky number game, played by people throughout the Metropolitan Boston area. The Boston Herald gives away cash prizes to the daily Wingo winners.

As a Member of Congress representing the city of Boston and surrounding towns, I am pleased to extend my hearty congratulations to the Boston Herald, whose Wingo game is not only entertaining but also gives thousands of citizens a chance at an economic opportunity that they might not otherwise be afforded.

I would also like to wish all the Wingo players in the Boston area the very best of luck.

I respectfully submit for the RECORD Mayor Flynn's proclamation declaring "Wingo Week" in Boston:

MAYOR RAYMOND FLYNN'S PROCLAMATION

Whereas: Wingo has provided excitement to countless thousands in the greater Boston area.

Whereas: Young and old alike have shared in the anticipation of the daily Wingo in their households;

Whereas: Wingo has provided many with the opportunity to improve the quality of life for themselves and their families;

Whereas: The Boston Herald has reached people in every neighborhood of Boston and made them aware of the potential to win at Wingo;

Therefore, I, Raymond L. Flynn, Mayor of the City of Boston, do hereby proclaim the week of March 4 through March 10, 1985 to be Wingo Week in the City of Boston and wish all my fellow Bostonians the best of luck at playing Wingo."●

JOHN MULLER RECEIVES "EXTRA MILE AWARD" FROM AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to inform my colleagues in the House that my good friend John H. Muller of Half Moon Bay, CA, has been named the recipient of the "Extra Mile Award" by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] of the Department of Agriculture.

The Extra Mile Award is a special commendation, normally given to professional employees of the ASCS. John is the first nonprofessional to receive it. The award is given in recognition of outstanding, one-time achievement in serving an individual farmer or farm.

The certificate recognizing John Muller commends his "intense personal effort and commitment displayed in pursuing a resolution to the problems of four San Mateo County farmers, personifying the dedication and concern exhibited by agricultural leaders across the country."

John has served as a member of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee for San Mateo County since 1975, and he has been its chairman for 4 of those years.

During a regular county committee meeting, John and the committee found an appeal by San Mateo farmers unacceptable on the basis of current regulations. Since the request had merit, John felt further action was needed. He assisted the farmers in finding an engineer, helped them rework their proposal, met with State and headquarters ASCS officials, and ultimately succeeded in winning approval for a pilot program to test their solution. Though John had no personal interest in this pilot program, he clearly went the extra mile on behalf of San Mateo County agriculture.

John Muller has long served agriculture in San Mateo County. He was president of the county Farm Bureau, and currently serves as a member of the board. He is a board member and president of the Northern California Flower Growers & Shippers Association, an officer of the Agricultural Leadership Associates, board member of the California State Florist's Association, and a member of the commit-

tee for the San Francisco Clean Water Program.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States are fortunate to have people such as John Muller—individuals who serve others with no expectation of personal benefit or reward, individuals willing to go the extra mile. I am honored to represent such fine people as John Muller, his wonderful wife Eda, and their daughters Heidi and Trudy.●

"IRISHMAN OF THE YEAR": JUDGE EDWARD J. BRADLEY

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Edward J. Bradley, who will be honored as "Irishman of the Year" by the Irish Society of Philadelphia at their annual banquet on March 30, 1985.

Mr. Bradley is the distinguished presiding judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. He has served on that court for 20 years. He was born, raised, and educated in Philadelphia, and after serving in the U.S. Navy, came home to devote his career to public service. That career has been marked by leadership in the government and legal communities, and by active involvement in community affairs.

I am happy to be able to join with the Irish Society of Philadelphia as they honor one of their own. Judge Bradley deserves our recognition for his noteworthy career of service and accomplishment.●

REBUTTAL OF STOCKMAN'S STATEMENTS

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of the military retirees in the 16th Congressional District of Texas were shocked at the unseemly assault by OMB Director David Stockman on those who have given so many years of their lives in our country's service. I would like to enter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comprehensive rejoinder to Stockman's charges, written by Lt. Col. (ret.) Robert Chisolm of El Paso, TX, who is now president of J-Tex, Inc. of El Paso.

The article is as follows:

[From the El Paso Herald-Post, Mar. 6, 1985]

REBUTTAL OF STOCKMAN'S STATEMENTS

(By Robert Chisolm)

David Stockman's recent statements concerning military retirement pay show poor

judgment, immaturity and a complete lack of knowledge of the rationale for the military retirement system.

As a retired member of the military I resent the implication and especially so since such comes from a high ranking member of the president's staff.

I would be quite willing to give up my retired pay if by doing so I could have back the muscle shot out of my right shoulder by an enemy machine gun. And give me back that part of my skull that is missing as a result of that same encounter which took place on my 19th birthday in Normandy. Return to me all of the flesh, muscle and tissue missing from my left thigh as a result of enemy artillery fire. And erase the scars left on my face, neck and body as a result of anti-aircraft artillery. Let me be able to walk, sleep and sit without being in constant pain as a result of my more than 28 years of service as an airborne infantryman. Replace the missing parts of my mangled left hand and let me have the full use of it once again.

And hand back to me the numerous days, weeks, months and years that I was separated from my family while fighting in three major conflicts in the defense of our country. Let me have the thrill of seeing my daughter take her first step and be with her for all those cherished moments most parents share with their children.

Compensate my wife for the worry, grief and long empty hours and days and weeks of trying to raise a child alone—all of this while her husband was thousands of miles away defending our country, not knowing for days on end if he was alive or dead.

Can you pay me for being on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week without receiving—or even thinking about—overtime? And would you—had you been willing to serve—have traded your accommodations as a divinity student for those I had in a snow-covered foxhole during the Battle of the Bulge, or for the months spent in the heat, filth and stench of war in Korea while fighting off the mass attacks of the Chinese.

And how would you have liked being in the steaming jungles of Vietnam, not knowing the enemy—except for those protesters in the states who were lending aid and comfort to that enemy while our young men were dying.

After all this was over and I was no longer physically able to serve, I thought about retirement pay. But let me assure you that my first thoughts, then and now, were always to preserve the freedom of this great country even if it meant giving my life. In all honesty, even if I could, I would never trade off the immense feeling of satisfaction and pride in having been honored by being allowed to serve my country and fight its enemies. This is a feeling Stockman will never experience.

Certainly, the great stress and frustration he must feel as budget director contributed to these unfounded remarks. But that frustration could never equal the grief of parents, wives, sons and daughters of the thousands of young Americans lying under those white crosses in our national cemeteries. I wonder if the last thought of those patriots was about retirement pay?

I would suggest that Stockman get into his government-furnished limousine and take a ride out to Arlington National Cemetery. That he get out, look around and reflect for a few minutes on what he said. Does he really believe that those buried there were more concerned about retirement pay than the defense of their country?

Robert Chisolm enlisted in the United States Army in 1942 as a private. He retired from the Army in 1970 as a lieutenant colonel. He is president of J-Tex Inc. of El Paso, manufacturers of industrial cloth.●

#### PROMOTE TECHNOLOGY WITH- IN FEDERAL LABORATORIES

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with a number of my colleagues the Federal Science and Technology Transfer Act of 1985, legislation which amends the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980. It is designed to promote economic growth, industrial productivity, and international trade competitiveness by encouraging utilization of technology developed within Federal laboratories.

Technological innovation is a wellspring for economic growth. It yields new or improved commercial products and processes, creating jobs and income as new industries are born and as existing industries expand. As an illustration, the commercialization or biotechnology has spawned a new, rapidly growing industry with worldwide sales that are projected to reach \$100 billion by the end of the century.

We must use technological innovation to help revive our basic industries. In the automobile industry, for example, utilization of new technologies during the next 15 years is expected to improve both the product and the production process. The use of advanced ceramic materials for critical engine components could reduce engine weight and cooling and lubrication requirements. New light-weight but high-strength metals, polymers, and fiber composites could reduce overall vehicle weight and improve fuel economy. Both of these advancements could also enhance competitiveness by reducing the price of the product. The competitive benefits of computer-aided design [CAD] and computer-aided automated manufacturing [CAM] technologies in the automotive industry are also widely recognized. The automobile industry is only one example. If we maintain a technological edge over our competitors and utilize the new technologies, we can provide a competitive advantage for many of our basic industries.

We must also reverse the recent erosion of our competitive edge in high-technology industries. The Nation's electronics sector amassed a \$6.8 billion trade deficit in 1984 according to Business Week. This is the first time that this traditionally healthy industry has ever ended a year in the red, and projections for 1985 are worse. The electronics sector is not alone; the

President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness noted in its recent report that the United States has lost world market share in 7 out of 10 high-technology sectors.

Although foreign trade barriers and the strength of the dollar are contributing factors to this decline, Business Week stated that the basic problem is the failure of American high-technology companies to consistently translate new technology into competitive products. The Commission on Industrial Competitiveness agreed and identified the creation and application of new technology as one of the four major ways in which the United States can become more competitive.

Much of the new technology that is available for utilization is produced in Federal laboratories. The Federal Government funds approximately half of this country's total research and development and much of this work is performed in Government-owned laboratories. Therefore, the Commission on Industrial Competitiveness recommended that the Federal Government manage its research and development with more concern for commercial application and competitiveness.

The Federal Science and Technology Transfer Act promotes more effective utilization of the technology produced by Federal laboratories. The scientific and engineering expertise, the technology base, and the facilities and equipment within these laboratories are valuable national resources. This legislation allows these resources to be more readily shared with private companies wishing to develop new products and with local governments in need of technical solutions to their problems.

To encourage technological innovation, this legislation enables Government-operated Federal laboratories to enter into cooperative research and development agreements with non-Federal parties. Federal scientists and engineers would be able to work side by side with their university or industrial counterparts on projects that were cofunded by their institutions. A basic premise of this arrangement is that research in the Federal laboratories can be better attuned to industrial needs without compromising the laboratories' missions and that the benefits that accrue to industry from the Federal share of the funding are in the national interest. This is consistent with the recommendations of the 1983 Federal Laboratory Review Panel of the White House Science Council.

The extensive interpersonal interaction allowed by these cooperative arrangements is generally believed to be an extremely effective method of technology transfer. In a recent study of NSF's Industry/University Cooperative Research Program, both industry and university participants lauded the

benefits of working closely together and being able to view the work from each other's perspective. Many experienced profound and beneficial changes in their attitudes toward science in general and in the way they approached their research in particular. I believe that scientists and engineers in the Federal laboratories would benefit similarly from the cooperative arrangements proposed in this legislation.

Under this act, cooperative R&D agreements would be subject to conditions that are designed to make the treatment of Government-owned, Government-operated [GOGO] laboratories consistent with the treatment of Government-owned, contractor-operated [GOCO] laboratories under last year's patent law amendments (Public Law 98-620). Nondomestic technology transfer is discouraged by requirements for participation only by U.S. entities and for U.S. manufacture of resulting products. Preference is also provided for small businesses. To prevent participating companies from obtaining an unfair competitive edge at Federal expense over others within their industry, agencies are instructed to develop plans for entering the agreements that provide reasonable opportunity for interested parties to participate.

To further promote technology transfer from the Federal laboratories, this bill institutionalizes the Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer [FLC] within the National Science Foundation. The FLC is currently an ad-hoc organization of representatives from over 300 Federal laboratories representing 11 Federal agencies. It has been the principal body during the last decade for facilitating technology transfer from the Federal sector. The effectiveness of the Federal Laboratory Consortium has been limited only by the resources available to it as an ad-hoc organization; a modest level of direct funding would greatly increase the level of technology transfer activities. To provide these funds, the bill provides a small set-aside from the R&D budgets of the Federal agencies.

Finally, the Federal Science and Technology Transfer Act encourages utilization of Federal technology through the distribution of patent royalties received by Federal agencies. Federally employed inventors are rewarded for their creativity with a small portion of the royalties from their inventions. A larger portion is used to enhance the budgets of the Government-operated laboratories responsible for the innovations. This provision is consistent with the treatment of contractor operated Federal laboratories under last year's patent law amendments and it provides incentives for the Government-operated

laboratories to seek commercialization of their new technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I cordially invite all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to work together with those of us introducing the legislation today. America is the greatest Nation on Earth and I believe that she would be made even greater by the increased economic growth, industrial productivity, and international trade competitiveness that enactment of this legislation would stimulate.●

STUDENT COALITION FOR  
SOVIET JEWRY

HON. STEVE BARTLETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I speak today regarding the Washington Lobby for Soviet Jewry, an annual program sponsored by the Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry, and held this year on Thursday, February 28. On that day, almost 700 students traveled to Washington, DC, and participated in a program designed to focus public and congressional attention on the ongoing persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

The Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry was founded in 1977 in response to the arrest of Anatoly B. Shcharansky. At that time, students from Brandeis University bought bus tickets to Washington, where they discussed Mr. Shcharansky's plight with Members of Congress. Since then, the journey to Washington by concerned students has become an annual event. This year, nearly 700 students, traveling from 37 States and between 40 and 50 colleges and universities, participated directly in the program in our Nation's Capital. Student lobbyists represented 175 congressional districts, including, I was pleased to note, the Third District of Texas.

Currently, I am one of four honorary chairmen for the 1985 Student Coalition, and on February 28 I had the privilege of addressing that group at the Adas Israel Synagogue in Washington, along with such distinguished Soviet Jewry activists as Avital Shcharansky, wife of prisoner of conscience Anatoly Shcharansky. I was impressed by the participants' enthusiasm and dedication to the cause of freedom for Soviet Jews.

That afternoon, students were briefed on the current situation of Soviet Jews and later visited with their Senators and Representatives on Capitol Hill to ask for their support and action. At that time, a letter to the President was presented to Members of Congress and they were asked to become signatories. As my colleagues are aware, this is a crucial

period in United States-Soviet relations, and the letter requests that the President include human rights and Soviet Jewry as part of the negotiating agenda at the Geneva talks begun March 12. I urge my colleagues to sign on to this important and timely request.

An extension of the Washington event is the International Student Solidarity Day for Soviet Jewry, which was developed to enable students who are beyond traveling distance to participate in student activism. This year, students at approximately 50 universities held programs on Soviet Jewry. Last year, for example, students at the University of Houston distributed information, petitions, and action alerts at the University Center. At the University of Texas at Austin, law professor David Sokolow, who met with refuseniks during a trip to the Soviet Union, conducted a discussion along with recently released refuseniks. Internationally, student programs on Soviet Jewry also took place in Canada, Israel, South Africa, and other countries.

I am proud to be affiliated with the Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry in 1985 and I am encouraged by what I have heard about its numerous activities, whether they be campus rallies, letters to Congress, or the adoption of refuseniks. These endeavors serve to remind others that the freedoms so abundant in this country are only a dream in the Soviet Union. In its effort to lobby Members with regard to the letter to the President, the Student Coalition is accomplishing an important goal. By making Soviet Jewry an issue of discussion at the arms talks, the United States will be making the fullest possible commitment to alleviating the suffering of those Jews still trapped in Russia. Groups such as the Student Coalition are critical today in that they lend new and effective voices to the drive to end repression of Soviet Jews.

The issue of Soviet Jewry is not solely a Jewish matter but is rather of interest to all of humanity. Ultimately, we must all consider ourselves Soviet Jews, for on some level, all people are vulnerable to the hatreds of totalitarianism, both of the far left, communism, and of the far right, fascism. Elimination of human rights abuses around the world will not be successful unless the world speaks up.●

AL TEGLIA—HUMANITARIAN OF  
THE YEAR FOR SAN MATEO  
COUNTY

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to inform my colleagues in the House that my good friend Al Teglia of Daly City, CA, has been named Humanitarian of the Year by the Easter Seal Society for Handicapped Children and Adults of San Mateo County.

The Easter Seal Society is well known for its dedicated service on behalf of the physically disabled, and the society is beginning its 40th year of service to our community. The society annually presents the "Humanitarian of the Year" award to an outstanding citizen who has given unstintingly of his or her time, talent, and concern for the advancement of opportunities for members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, Albert M. Teglia is indeed a worthy recipient of this distinguished award. A life-long resident of the Daly City-Colma area, he has spent most of his life in service to others—as councilman and mayor of Daly City, as a member and leader of many local commissions and service organizations, and as a trustee of the Jefferson Union High School District. His contributions have touched almost every facet of San Mateo County including education, the arts, youth employment, and minority interests.

Al Teglia will be honored at a special dinner on March 21 which will benefit the Easter Seal Society for Handicapped Children and Adults of San Mateo County. I congratulate the distinguished committee of business and civic leaders, chaired by Frank Pacelli, which organized the dinner and which has named Al Teglia Humanitarian of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate this generous public servant, whose impact for good in San Mateo County is now being suitably recognized.●

OLDER AMERICANS' MONTH

**HON. BILL McCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor of introducing a resolution cosponsored by 272 of my colleagues calling on President Reagan to declare May 1985 "Older Americans Month."

This resolution expresses our gratitude and appreciation to all of the senior Americans who have given so much to make our country great. We

all know the wealth of knowledge and experience they possess and we value the many years they devoted to the betterment of our families, communities and Nation as a whole. None of us has to look very far to see how much our senior citizens have done for our country—and continue to do. They have developed a strong working relationship with the Federal government as well as a interest in the issues that affect their neighbors, and themselves. Through their active involvement in the political process Congress is able to better understand the special concerns of older Americans and pinpoint the best ways to meet them.

This measure calls on the President to make the official designation and asks citizens to plan special activities to commemorate the month-long observance. It is a great honor to be part of a nationwide observance which means so much to so many deserving people.●

ST. ANN'S INFANT AND  
MATERNITY HOME

**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this year a unique facility in my district, St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home, is celebrating the 125th anniversary of its founding.

St. Ann's was the District of Columbia's first foundling home. Started in August of 1860 by three Sisters of Charity who came from Emmitsburg, MD, St. Ann's was granted a congressional charter which was signed by President Abraham Lincoln on March 3, 1863. Since February 1962, it has been located at its present site on Eastern Avenue in Hyattsville.

For all of its 125 years, St. Ann's has been a haven for thousands of unwed mothers, providing them with prenatal care and providing their children with extensive aftercare. St. Ann's also offers a residential program both for children up to age ten who are awaiting adoption or placement in foster homes, and for those who have been abused and neglected. With the hope that my congressional district will continue to be the home of this exemplary facility for years to come, I salute the continuing good work of St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home.

For the last 8 years, Sister Elyse Staab had served as director of St. Ann's providing concerned and loving services to the mothers and children of the home. She was recently transferred back to Emmitsburg to the Provincial House to serve as directress of the seminary. I wish Sister Elyse success and happiness in the years to come. At this time I would like to in-

clude in the RECORD the resolution which was adopted by the St. Ann's Board of Trustees on Sister Elyse's departure.

The resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Board of Trustees of St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home that our Administrator, Sister Elyse Staab, has been designated by The Provincial Superior of the Daughters of Charity to assume new duties as Directress of the Seminary at the Provincial House in Emmitsburg, Maryland and

Whereas Sister Elyse has performed the functions as Administrator of St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home since 1976 in an exemplary and Christ-like manner and

Whereas Sister Elyse has given of herself 7 days a week, 24 hours a day during the entire period and

Whereas Sister Elyse, following in the footsteps of her model, Jesus Christ, has brought love, understanding, and new hope into the lives of the unwed mothers and their children at St. Ann's Home.

It is hereby resolved by the Board of Trustees that we manifest our admiration, our love, our esteem and our heartfelt thanks to Sister Elyse

By voting her the Abraham Lincoln Certificate of Service for her sacrifices and unselfish devotion to those in need, and by our vote, extend to her our heartfelt thanks and pray that Almighty God will grant her His continued love and guidance in her new endeavors and

Lastly, to wish Sister Elyse health, happiness and great satisfaction in her new undertaking.

We, the Board of Trustees, as a token of our appreciation for her outstanding example she has demonstrated to us throughout the years, adopt this resolution on this 9th day of January, 1985.●

PROHIBIT THE USE OF CERTAIN  
CHEMICALS IN DRINKING  
WATER

**HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a simple bill to prohibit the use of certain chemicals in public drinking water systems.

The text of the bill reads:

No chemical substance may be added artificially to the water of any public water system for any purpose other than to render such water safe for human consumption, to test such water for contamination, or to improve the taste or clarity of such water.

The practice of adding chemicals to water supplies which do not serve the above purposes violates the fundamental principle that people should not be forced to ingest medicines or chemicals against their will, except where there is no other feasible way of protecting the health of others. Some communities add chemicals such as fluorides to the water for the sole purpose of preventing tooth decay. How-

ever, for at least some people, this chemical may in fact threaten their health. The practice of adding fluoride to the water supplies is especially troubling because fluorides are readily available to the public in other forms such as toothpaste and rinses. Therefore it is neither necessary nor desirable to add these chemicals to the public water supplies.

We should be especially concerned about the precedent created by adding chemicals to the public water supply in order to treat a small segment of the public or to give people what someone has decided is good for them, whether they want it or not. If it can be done with one chemical in the name of combatting tooth decay, why not add iodides to combat goiter, potassium to combat high blood pressure, tranquilizers to combat tension, and so on? The possibilities are endless. The dangers are obvious.

Our aim should be to ensure that our drinking water is safe—safe from disease and poisons, safe from zealots who would use it to impose on the rest of us their supposed solutions to our private problems.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
HON. ALEXANDER POTASH OF  
NEW JERSEY, ESTEEMED  
MAYOR, OUTSTANDING COM-  
MUNITY LEADER, AND GREAT  
AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 13, the people of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together with the citizens of the borough of Oakland in testimony to one of our most distinguished citizens, outstanding community leader and good friend, the Honorable Alexander Potash, in testimony to his lifetime of good works on behalf of the people of our community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in deep appreciation of all of his good works and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife, Velma; sons James, William, Edwin, and David; daughters Eleanor and Carol Ann; 19 grandchildren and 3 great-grandchildren on this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Alexander Potash has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us who have the good fortune to know him. He has had a long and illustrious career in seeking life's fulfillment and purpose. He was born on December 26, 1899, in New York City. His paternal grandparents emigrated to

our country from Germany and his maternal grandparents left London, England, to make the United States of America their home. His parents were born in New York City.

He attended elementary school to third grade in Brooklyn NY, and when his parents moved to Paterson, NJ, completed his education at local schools in Paterson. Upon his graduation at the age of 15 years from Old School No. 4, Paterson, he immediately went to work in a machine shop. He was proud to have been a forward player on the 1914 School No. 4 basketball team which won the interscholastic basketball championship.

At the age of 17, Alexander left the machine shop to commence employment as a clerk at the Belleville, NJ, railroad station. He served 18 years with the Erie Railroad. He forged ahead with diligence, dedication, and sincerity of purpose moving along through the ranks of the Erie Railroad operations to become superintendent of their docks and warehouse at Jersey City, NJ.

On May 1, 1927, Alexander and Velma Potash established their home in Oakland, NJ. In the course of his public service career pursuits with the borough of Oakland, he joined the Oakland Volunteer Fire Department and in 1928 was elected president of the department. In 1929, he was appointed tax assessor and served for the next 21 years, until 1951, as the borough's tax assessor. The excellence of his knowhow and expertise in the performance of his duties and responsibilities as the borough's tax assessor is manifested in the fact that to this date the assessor's office maintains the system of records that he installed.

In 1930, Mr. Potash was elected president of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. In 1951, he was first elected to the governing body of the borough of Oakland. He was reelected to the borough council in 1952 and served as a councilman for 3 years before being elected mayor in 1953.

Our community, State, and Nation have indeed been enriched by the quality of this leadership and wealth of his wisdom and caring as the elected chief executive officer of the borough of Oakland during his tenure of 8 years (1953-61). He has most assuredly helped to make Oakland a better community to live in and America more beautiful.

Mr. Speaker, the borough of Oakland is situated in a valley between the Campgaw and Ramapo Mountains with the Ramapo River flowing through the valley—a beautiful, natural setting. It was a rural community of 800 people when Mayor Potash and his young bride, Vilma, adopted Oakland as their home.

The town consisted of many fields and woods and when Alexander was a

fireman, there were no water mains or fire hydrants in the community. The firemen carried the water supply in Indian tanks strapped on their backs. The fire company's transportation equipment consisted of two trucks, one to carry the pumper and one to carry water supplies. The fire department now consists of two firehouses located in strategic parts of town. The equipment is modern, including a tower truck. All streets are water-mained and hydranted.

Mr. Speaker, it was during Alexander Potash's years as mayor that the borough of Oakland had its greatest growth. Among the many ordinances passed during his tenure for the safety of Oakland's residents and the protection of private property, Mayor Potash fostered the establishment of a shade tree commission, industrial commission, and recreation commission to assist the mayor and council in the management of the community.

In 1957, as mayor and a member of the planning board, he promoted and encouraged a complete rezoning of Oakland, upgrading all zones in size to preserve and maintain as much of its open space as possible. During the same year, a municipal building was constructed to accommodate the growing public service needs of the community. The planning and construction of one of Oakland's landmark community service projects, Veterans Park, was undertaken in 1958 and dedicated as a memorial to the veterans of all wars in 1961.

While mayor, Alexander Potash was also a member of the borough's library board of trustees and will long be remembered for his efforts in seeking to have the Pond's Memorial Building acquired to provide adequate space to house Oakland's Public Library. The library edifice which was constructed with stones from the Old Pond's Church of 1829—hence its name, Pond's Memorial Building—still serves as Oakland's Public Library. In discussing its history with Mayor Potash he will respond that the purchase was accomplished with the approval of the council; the carpeting used in the building was donated by the business community of Oakland; and credit must be given to Mayor Clifford McEvoy who has successful in obtaining WPA Government funds for the construction of the Pond's Memorial Building when he was mayor of Oakland.

Upon leaving the stewardship of his high office of public trust as mayor of Oakland, Alexander Potash was successful in being elected to the board of education where he served as chairman of the building and grounds committee. It was during this period of 1966 to 1967 that the Dogwood Hill Elementary School was built.

Mr. Speaker, Al Potash's personal commitment to the economic, social, and cultural enhancement of the borough of Oakland has been a way of life for him. He continues to actively participate in public affairs of the community. ●

**HONORING ESTHER COWAN—RECIPIENT OF THE BELMONT PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD**

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Esther Cowan of California's 11th Congressional District. Mrs. Cowan has been named the recipient of the 1985 Belmont Congressional Public Service Award. I am delighted that she is receiving this award—Esther has been a contributing and caring member of the community for many years.

Esther has been a resident of Belmont for over 25 years, and she and her husband Bill have raised five wonderful children. Despite the heavy demands of caring for her family, Esther still found time for volunteer work of all kinds. Her example helps prove the maxim "The more you do, the more you can do."

She has been an outstanding youth leader. For many years she served in various positions in both Brownies and Girl Scouts. She served as coordinating Chair of the parent-teachers' association for 20 years. At the 4-H Club, where she was a project leader and barn treasurer, she taught cooking and raised funds for 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize in particular Esther Cowan's service to the disabled and handicapped of San Mateo County. It requires a person of special ability and unusual qualities to give as selflessly as has Esther to this cause. She has worked closely with the Women's American Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training [ORT]—a group which teaches vocational skills in 27 countries. She is president of the Oleander chapter, regional vice president, and active in fund raising for many years.

Esther has contributed her fundraising expertise to the Children's Health Council—a group affiliated with Stanford University Hospital and dedicated to helping children with neurological, emotional, and learning handicaps.

This unselfish sharing of time and energy is truly remarkable. Temple Beth Jacob has also benefited from her enthusiasm and energy—she has organized numerous rummage sales and other fundraising events. Through the years she has raised thousands

and thousands of dollars, which have been used to improve the community and enrich the lives of countless people.

I wish to thank and to congratulate the Belmont City Public Service Award Committee under the chairmanship of Don Heiman on its outstanding choice. I am delighted to present to Esther Cowan the Congressional Public Service Award for Belmont for 1985. ●

**LEGISLATION TO ASSIST NOAA CORPS GRADUATES**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our country faces national concern with our educational systems, we should aggressively be seeking ways in which to assist young people in furthering their education. Such incentives are critical to our future security—and intellectual as well as military strength as a nation.

The Higher Education Act to 1965 stands as the central monument of the Federal Government's commitment to higher educational opportunity for all students and citizens. Specifically, the Guaranteed Student Loan Program has been a critical force in providing educational opportunity—as well as educational choice—to students from all income levels.

Under the GSL Program, active duty members of the uniformed services are eligible for deferments on repayments of their students loans of up to 3 years. Under current law, those personnel eligible for this deferment include members of the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service Corps. There is another uniformed service—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Corps—that is not eligible for this deferment.

This small, but important component of our national defense consists of approximately 372 commissioned personnel. Unfortunately, this group of commissioned officers was overlooked in the drafting, and subsequent reauthorizations of HEA. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1198, that would include the NOAA Corps, graduates in that group of commissioned officers eligible for deferments under HEA.

As a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I firmly believe that this bill is necessary because of a small oversight by the framers of the act. I am personally familiar with the NOAA Corps as I also serve as chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee which oversees these programs, and where

this problem was originally brought to my attention by a young man who was ineligible for a deferment, despite his commissioned status. Since the act is scheduled for reauthorization this year, I believe that H.R. 1198 could be considered at that time. Passage of this small but important provision will provide equity for all commissioned officers in our Nation's defense. ●

**THE POOR AND OUR NATIONAL BUDGET**

**HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention and the attention of my colleagues the excellent statement that was prepared by the Lutheran Bishops of America on our Federal budget.

**THE POOR AND OUR NATIONAL BUDGET**

The nation's fundamental priorities are reflected in the budget choices it makes. This year, the soaring federal deficit makes particularly difficult the decisions on how much revenue our nation must raise and how that revenue is to be spent. Amid the clamor of various groups seeking to protect their own interests, the church must speak clearly on behalf of those at home and abroad whose pressing human needs require not only private charity but also government action.

Our deficit dilemma has no painless solutions. However, the sacrifice required must be distributed in accordance with the ability of individuals and groups to bear it. The allocation of limited resources should be based on a thorough evaluation of the utility and effectiveness of tax breaks, military spending and social programs.

In working for a fair "distribution of sacrifice," budget cuts and tax changes proposed for the 1986 fiscal year should be viewed in their broader context. Programs for the poor, which comprise approximately one-tenth of the federal budget, have been cut proportionately deeper than other programs benefiting all Americans. In addition, while the 1981 tax cut decreased the tax burden of many affluent Americans, persons at or below the poverty line have found themselves paying a greater percentage of their income in taxes. Due to these changes and to the effects of the recent recession, the standard of living of many poor Americans has deteriorated significantly and their numbers have grown. While voluntary organizations have responded to this increase in poverty, they have not been able to ensure that the needs of the poor—many of them children—are adequately met.

Given the high rate of both unemployment and poverty, we believe that a top budgetary priority should be securing adequate funding for human needs and income maintenance programs, with federal standards ensuring that such funds are targeted to persons in greatest need. We would assert that:

No one in this prosperous country should be forced by economic conditions to go hungry or homeless or lack adequate medical care. Even with current funding levels,

federal benefits to poor families are often insufficient to provide adequately for their basic needs. We therefore oppose any further reductions in the programs—the so-called “social safety net”—which provide for the immediate needs of low-income Americans: Food Stamps, Aid to Families With Dependent Children, Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income for the elderly poor, and low-income housing and energy assistance programs. Eliminating cost-of-living adjustments or “freezing” funding levels for these programs will further depress the overall standard of living of low-income families. Given the cuts which have already been made in these programs in recent years, we cannot support such a strategy.

Targeting special assistance to persons with special needs is good short and long-term public policy. A dollar saved in program cuts today may result tomorrow in extended health care costs, disruptions in earnings, unemployment and other drains on our economy. For example, the WIC program provides special foods to certain low-income pregnant and nursing women, infants and children. However, even at current funding levels, many persons certified to be at nutritional risk are already being turned away, increasing the possibility of long-term damage to their health. Further cuts would exacerbate this situation. Social services to keep families intact, child nutrition efforts, and health programs addressing the specific needs of low-income children are a crucial investment in our nation's welfare.

Persons with earnings at or below the poverty line should not pay federal income taxes. The 1981 cut in tax rates did little to address the specific needs of the working poor. Failure to adjust for inflation the earned income tax credit and other tax provisions means that the government is taxing away a greater and greater percentage of the dollars which the poor desperately need to provide a minimal living standard. This makes little social sense and should be changed.

Programs which address some of the root causes of poverty should be strengthened and improved. These programs include education assistance for disadvantaged students and communities, job training and legal services. Efforts to reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment, which is devastating to individuals and families, must be a major commitment of government.

The needs of the poor abroad cannot be ignored. The African tragedy highlights the need for both direct food aid and development assistance in less developed areas throughout the world. The outpouring of donations to deal with famine indicates deep concern over the plight of the hungry abroad. However, the work of our voluntary agencies complements but cannot replace intentional government action in areas of aid, trade and development.

Our churches assert that the responsibility for addressing the needs of the poor is shared among individuals and institutions at every level of society. Private charity certainly plays an important role in this endeavor, and we encourage our own members to continue responding generously to the growing problems of poverty, both at home and abroad. But in our complex and highly mobile society, meeting the needs of the poor in all localities is beyond the capacity of charitable institutions. The federal government has an appropriate role in meeting immediate needs, as well as addressing the systemic causes of poverty. We value part-

nership between the voluntary and the government sectors in attempting to assist the poor to participate more fully in our economic life—but we strongly resist cuts in funding which undermine that partnership and seriously reduce the government's role in meeting pressing human needs.

LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

(The Rev. James R. Crumley, Jr., Bishop, Lutheran Church in America)

The Rev. John Adam, Bishop, Slovak Zion Synod.

The Rev. Dennis A. Anderson, Bishop, Nebraska Synod.

The Rev. Thomas L. Blevins, Bishop, Pacific Northwest Synod.

The Rev. Herman W. Cauble, Bishop, South Carolina Synod.

The Rev. Herbert W. Chilstrom, Bishop, Minnesota Synod.

The Rev. Edelmiro Cortes, Bishop, Caribbean Synod.

The Rev. Paul E. Erickson, Bishop, Illinois Synod.

The Rev. Roger J. Gieschen, Bishop, Central States Synod.

The Rev. James A. Graefe, Bishop, Metropolitan New York Synod.

The Rev. Lawrence L. Hand, Bishop, Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod.

The Rev. Franklin C. Heglund, Bishop, Rocky Mountain Synod.

The Rev. Raymond A. Heine, Bishop, Michigan Synod.

The Rev. Herluf M. Jensen, Bishop, New Jersey Synod.

The Rev. Ralph A. Kempinski, Bishop, Indiana—Kentucky Synod.

The Rev. Harold R. Lohr, Bishop, Red River Valley Synod.

The Rev. Kenneth R. May, Bishop, Western Pennsylvania—West Virginia Synod.

The Rev. Howard J. McCarney, Bishop, Central Pennsylvania Synod.

The Rev. Michael C.D. McDaniel, Bishop, North Carolina Synod.

The Rev. Virgil A. Moyer, Jr., Bishop, Virginia Synod.

The Rev. Stanley E. Olson, Bishop, Pacific Southwest Synod.

The Rev. Edward K. Perry, Bishop, Upper New York Synod.

The Rev. Kenneth H. Sauer, Bishop, Ohio Synod.

The Rev. Gerald S. Troutman, Bishop, Southeastern Synod.

The Rev. Philip L. Wahlberg, Bishop, Texas—Louisiana Synod.

The Rev. Harold S. Weiss, Bishop, Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod.

The Rev. Paul M. Werger, Bishop, Iowa Synod.

The Rev. Robert S. Wilcoh, Bishop, Wisconsin—Upper Michigan Synod.

The Rev. Harold R. Wimmer, Bishop, New England Synod.

The Rev. Royall A. Yount, Bishop, Florida Synod.

The Rev. Morris G. Zumbun, Bishop, Maryland Synod.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH

(The Rev. David W. Preus, Presiding Bishop, The American Lutheran Church)

The Rev. Darold H. Beekmann, Bishop, Southwestern Minnesota District.

The Rev. Bernell L. Boehm, Bishop, Ohio District.

The Rev. L. David Brown, Bishop, Iowa District.

The Rev. Norman D. Eitheim, Bishop, South Dakota District.

The Rev. Lowell O. Erdahl, Bishop, Southeastern Minnesota District.

The Rev. Wesley N. Haugen, Bishop, Eastern North Dakota District.

The Rev. Robert H. Herder, Bishop, Northern Wisconsin District.

The Rev. Reginald H. Holle, Bishop, Michigan District.

The Rev. E. Harold Jansen, Bishop, Eastern District.

The Rev. Gilbert M. Lee, Bishop, Northern Minnesota District.

The Rev. Clifford R. Lunde, Bishop, North Pacific District.

The Rev. Ehme R. Osterbur, Bishop, Illinois District.

The Rev. A.C. Schumacher, Bishop, Southern Wisconsin District.

The Rev. Marvin J. Schumacher, Bishop, Western North Dakota District.

The Rev. Nelson W. Trout, Bishop, South Pacific District.

The Rev. Wayne E. Weissenbuehler, Bishop, Central District.

The Rev. August E. Wenzel, Bishop, Southern District.

The Rev. Norman G. Wick, Bishop, Rocky Mountain District.

The Rev. David A. Wolber, Bishop, South-eastern District.

ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCHES

(Will L. Herzfeld, Bishop, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches)

The Rev. Walter W. Grumm, Bishop, Pacific Regional Synod.

The Rev. Harold L. Hecht, Bishop, English Synod.

The Rev. Rudolph P.F. Rössmeyer, Bishop, East Coast Synod.

The Rev. Robert H. Studtmann, Bishop, Southwest Regional Synod.●

YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a joint resolution to designate June of this year as “Youth Suicide Prevention Month.”

The suicide rate for our Nation's youth has more than tripled in the last 25 years. This year we can expect as many as 6,000 Americans under the age of 25 to take their own lives. Perhaps as many as 2 million more will try unsuccessfully.

Suicide is now the third leading cause of death for Americans aged 15-24, trailing only homicides and accidents.

Youth suicide is a national epidemic which can no longer be ignored. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and help give this tragic problem the attention it deserves.●

JOINT COMMITTEE ON  
INTELLIGENCE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced House Joint Resolution 7 which would create a Joint Committee on Intelligence, and am today filing a list of cosponsors.

Over the past few years, the sheer size of the existing congressional intelligence oversight arrangement has increased the opportunities for leaks damaging to our national security. These revelations also have contributed to a serious deterioration in relations between the CIA and Congress with a consequent loss of trust—the most vital ingredient in the oversight process. Congress is an inherently political institution, and the leaking of sensitive information to achieve a partisan objective has become a Washington art form. I hasten to add this practice is not confined to congressional sources—the executive branch has played this game as well over the years. That fact of life notwithstanding, I believe that we must establish a system that will significantly tighten up intelligence oversight. One of the intelligence community's most respected voices, Admiral (Ret.) Bobby Inman, resigned as a consultant to the House Intelligence Committee because he felt it had become politically partisan. He put it best when he remarked that "if the country doesn't establish a bipartisan approach to intelligence, we are not going to face the problems of the next 50 years."

House Joint Resolution 7 would bring about a new oversight mechanism by mandating that the existing House and Senate intelligence panels be replaced with a joint committee composed of nine members from each Chamber. Needless to say, the leadership of both parties would be expected to select individuals who have exhibited the requisite trustworthiness, competence and responsibility, as well as the proven ability to subordinate political considerations to the national interest. Staff support would be provided by a small cadre of apolitical professionals with the same exemplary personal qualities as the committee's members. Creating a Joint Intelligence Committee along these lines would help diminish the possibilities for partisan posturing and significantly reduce the number of individuals having routine access to sensitive information, thus minimizing the risk of damaging, unauthorized disclosures. At the same time it would retain in a more effective and concentrated manner congressional supervision over the activities of our intelligence agencies and preclude the possibility of ex-

ecutive branch intelligence components playing one committee off against the other.

House Joint Resolution 7 also addresses some other practical problems that have resulted from two committees overseeing the intelligence community. As we have learned, the two committees often reflect different perspectives, and they frequently do not focus on the same topics. Moreover, there is not enough interaction or coordination on the issues, contrary to what most of us had assumed. For example, the media last year carried unattributed criticisms from the House Intelligence Committee that the CIA may have overspent its budget in its supposedly covert operations in Nicaragua. This view was not shared by the Senate Intelligence Committee. Confusion prevailed.

Congress has increasingly insisted upon being consulted and briefed by the executive branch concerning national security and foreign policy questions. A large percentage of these are intelligence related and require the involvement of high level executive branch officials who are often hard-pressed to meet the demands of both the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This is particularly true during fast-breaking crisis situations. A consolidated oversight panel would provide one point of contact for consultation and briefings in those instances where time is of the essence.

In summary, a Joint Intelligence Committee would not only eliminate the problems just cited, but it would also encourage bipartisan cooperation, and thus ensure a more effective, depoliticized congressional oversight process.

Following is a list of cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 7:

Mr. KASICH of Ohio, Mr. LAGOMARINO of California, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. RUDD of Arizona, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. MONTGOMERY of Mississippi, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia, Mr. McGRATH of New York, Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan, Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, and Mr. LUNGREN of California.●

CHAIRMAN JONES' GREAT  
LAKES SPEECH

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes, America's Fourth Seacoast, has in the past felt like the fourth cousin come uninvited to Sunday dinner—not quite turned

away, but certainly not one of the family.

In recent years, however, the Great Lakes has made progress in achieving its potential to be a fully integrated, equal partner in America's maritime commerce.

It is refreshing for me, as a Member of Congress representing a Great Lakes port, and serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to have our committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WALTER B. JONES], take such an active role in encouraging Great Lakes commerce. As chairman, he has recognized that the growth of each port range contributes to the strength of our national transportation system, and of our ability to compete in world markets.

On March 13, Chairman JONES spoke to the Great Lakes Task Force at the task force's annual Washington breakfast. Chairman JONES reaffirmed his support of the Great Lakes as a vital part of the Nation's maritime network. It was a good thoughtful, balanced statement, and I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

## REMARKS OF HON. WALTER B. JONES

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. We are here to discuss the health of the U.S. maritime industry in the Great Lakes and on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Your own interest in this subject is easily explained. But some of you may be wondering why a Representative from the South has any particular interest in the Great Lakes. The answer is that the economic health of our country is not regional in nature. We need more concern and sensitivity nationally.

Besides, people in the South have traditionally been concerned about the welfare of their Northern friends. . . .

Ever since I became Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I have been concerned, and have expressed this concern publicly over and over again, that U.S.-flag service generally is in a state of rapid decline. My observations have been, and continue to be, that nothing currently being proposed stands in the way of a continued decline from our former position as the most prominent maritime nation in the world.

We have observed nation after nation granting extraordinary benefits to investors in shipping activity with the condition that they fly the flag of that nation. Lesser developed nations have promoted their shipbuilding industries by selling vessels at well below cost to the operator, and banking and other financial interests in those countries have provided funding at well below market cost while the USA through its foreign policy programs subsidizes the economies of those very same countries. We have reached the point where we have exceeded the point of reasonable generosity; our "hands-off" or "free-trade" philosophy is accelerating a decline in some of our most essential industries. I predict that this disease may become endemic to all economic activity in the United States if there is not some reversal of form.

A case in point is the Great Lakes. We once could count on U.S.-flag shipping to be the dominant factor. But now, it has de-

clined to the point that there is no U.S.-flag shipping to speak of that is engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States using the Lakes or Lake Ports. We have also observed that in the bilateral trade between the United States and Canada, the vessels that are carrying this trade are not flying the United States flag. This situation compares sadly with the condition of the U.S. Great Lakes fleet in the past when we had significant numbers of vessels operating between the United States and our neighbor to the north.

I believe that this deterioration of U.S.-flag presence on the Great Lakes provides an example of what may happen to the rest of our maritime trades. Perhaps by an intensive study of Great Lakes trade, we can determine what went wrong there, how we might correct it, and how we might avoid a similar decline elsewhere. I have requested the General Accounting Office to undertake a study and to give us a complete picture of how we achieved the current status on the Lakes. I am particularly concerned about government policies employed by other countries that give unfair advantage to their carriers when competing with U.S.-flag carriers in the bilateral trade. In a world in which everyone speaks of free trade, it seems to be ridiculous for the United States to be the only one that implements the philosophy.

During my tenure as Chairman of this committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I will not sit silently by and allow an essential element of our national economic well being suffer. The Great Lakes, the U.S. Merchant Marine and other activities involved in the U.S. maritime enterprise are worth saving. I know we can count on you to be a part of the effort to save them.

Thank you very much.●

**BLAME THE CRIMINAL—NOT THE VICTIM**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a 23-year police veteran and one who was deeply saddened at the senseless murder earlier this year of D.C. Police Sgt. Joseph Cournoyer, I wish to insert a very insightful statement about Sergeant Cournoyer's death. It was written by Assistant U.S. Attorney General Lois Haight Herrington and it appeared in the Washington Post shortly after Sergeant Cournoyer's death.

Her message is right on target. Too much of the blame for violent crime is somehow being shifted away from the criminal and onto the victim. This is a message worth remembering as we continue our anticrime crusade here in the Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1985]

**BLAMING THE VICTIM, ONCE AGAIN**

I read about a tragedy the other day. A lone D.C. police officer, Sgt. Joseph Cournoyer, chased an armed robber who had run onto a bus. The officer followed to catch the robber and protect the people on the bus. Everything worked—the officer removed

the robber from the bus to make people safe—but, as Cournoyer stood on the loading platform, the robber fatally shot him at point-blank range.

As I read the newspaper accounts and followed the press coverage, it seemed there was something not quite right about the story, and at first I couldn't put my finger on it. Then it struck me: The whole focus of attention was not on this cold-blooded act of violence and the killer responsible for it. Instead, the issue was raised repeatedly that the officer wasn't wearing a bullet-proof vest, as if somehow it was the officer's fault that he had been murdered.

At first blush this appears to be a legitimate inquiry. But when we analyze it, what we are doing is blaming the victim of the crime and not the criminal. We've lost track of the simple notion that every citizen has the right to be safe on our streets, in our homes and in our communities.

We hear the questions asked in the media and in our courts: "What were you doing on that street after dark?" "Why didn't you have a dead-bolt lock on your front door? How could you drive with your car doors unlocked?"

There has been an insidious change in our national thinking. We've put the burden on the innocent citizen to stay out of harm's way rather than requiring, as any civilization must, that people don't break the law. We've accepted, without knowing it, a siege mentality in which we have no right to feel safe unless we are behind locked doors and insulated by bullet-proof vests.

As long as we accept that view, we are condemned to be victims—victims of those who prey upon the innocent and victims of our own shifted values and expectations.

It is time to take back the right. It is time to recommit ourselves to making our communities safe havens for those who obey the law and not abandoned territories to those who would break it.

Sgt. Cournoyer's death was a senseless tragedy. But it is also an important legacy. That young officer's last act was to point us back to the truth that the responsibility for violence in this country lies with those who do it, not those who suffer it.●

**FOUNDING OF SEABEES**

**HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Board of Supervisors of Orange County, CA, adopted a resolution in honor of the 43d anniversary of the founding of the Seabees.

I, too, believe that the contributions the naval construction battalions have made to the security of our Nation and to the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world deserve recognition.

Since their formation on March 5, 1942, the Seabees, with their "Can Do" slogan, have exemplified the spirit that makes America great. And, I am proud to note that the Reserve Seabee units, some 18,000 reservists strong, are headquartered at El Toro Marine Corps Air Station in the 40th District I represent.

It is an honor for me to join the members of the board of supervisors and the people of Orange County in paying tribute to the Seabees, and I ask that the resolution adopted by the board of supervisors be printed in the RECORD at this point.

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

On motion of Supervisor Thomas F. Riley, duly seconded and carried, the following Resolution was adopted:

Whereas, there are certain days set aside by our great nation whereby the citizens of this and other states pay homage to our Armed Forces; and

Whereas, on these occasions, marked by celebration and prayer, the dedicated men and women who have been and are serving our country in its quest for freedom for all nations, are given due recognition and appreciation; and

Whereas, one segment of our Armed Forces is the Navy's Construction Battalions, commonly known as the "SEABEES," whose famous "CAN DO" slogan exemplifies the true spirit of men whether it be in the height of battle or in the repair and construction of facilities to support military operations; and

Whereas, the SEABEES, both Regular and Reserve, through their professionalism, knowledge of construction and individual skills, contribute to the maintenance of freedom; and

Whereas, since the founding of the Navy SEABEES on March 5, 1942, many citizens of Orange County have served in that organization during peace and strife and, through individual skill and expertise, fulfilled their motto "With Compassion for Others We Build—We Fight for Peace With Freedom"; and

Whereas, the headquarters of the 18,000 man reserve, which commands Reserve Seabee units across this great land, is located in Orange County aboard Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Orange County Board of Supervisors does proclaim March 5, 1985, the 43rd Anniversary of the formation of the Naval Construction Battalions, as "SEABEE DAY" in Orange County.●

**BIELARUSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 will mark the 67th anniversary of the independence of the Bielarussian National Republic. This day is historic in man's struggle for freedom and self-determination, and I am glad to have the opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues this important event in the history of free peoples.

The Bielarussian Coordinating Committee of Chicago, IL, an organization dedicated to the restoration of human liberty in Bielarus, is again sponsoring a banquet and program to commemorate this anniversary and to renew its

commitment to human rights violations against their fellow countrymen at the hands of the Communists.

This year's program will take place on Sunday, March 24, at 12:30 p.m., at the Regency Inn Banquet Halls, 5319 West Diversey Avenue, in Chicago, and I extend to all those in attendance my warmest best wishes as they continue to contribute mightily to the ideals of freedom and human dignity. The commemoration will include recitations of poems, as well as musical renditions, which are a part of Bielarussian heritage and tradition.

In conjunction with this anniversary banquet, the Bielarussian Coordinating Committee is sponsoring a cultural exhibit at the Richard J. Daley Civil Center from March 25 through March 29. The exhibit will focus attention on the Bielarussian culture and heritage, as well as the traditions of Bielarussian Americans living in Chicago. Another exhibit sponsored by the Bielarussian Coordinating Committee, appears in the office window of State Representative Penny Pullen at 22 Main Street, in Park Ridge from March 18 through April 15. The window has been decorated in the Bielarussian Easter tradition.

Both the Governor of Illinois, the Honorable James R. Thompson, and the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Harold Washington, have issued proclamations to commemorate the 67th anniversary of Bielarussian independence, and those proclamations follow:

#### STATE OF ILLINOIS—PROCLAMATION

This year marks the sixty-seventh anniversary of the day when Bielarussian independence from Moscow was proclaimed. On March 25, 1918, restoration of Bielarussian statehood began. Its free existence, however, was short lived.

By 1921 many of the bonds which still chain them to Moscow were established. The Bielarussians are still fighting for liberation from Soviet Russian domination.

Here in Illinois, several Bielarussian organizations will observe their Independence Day with special activities in Chicago.

The Bielarussian people stand as a reminder that not all the world's people share the freedoms we take for granted here in the United States.

Therefore, I, James R. Thompson, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim March 25, 1985, as "Bielarussian Independence Day" in Illinois.

#### CITY OF CHICAGO—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, March 25th will mark the sixty-seventh anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Bielarus; and

Whereas, this day is being observed by Bielarussian communities throughout the free world as a day of celebration of freedom, unity and solidarity for the Bielarussian people throughout the world; and

Whereas, the 10 million Bielarussian people residing in their Russian occupied homeland, deprived of their right to observe this day, will be remembered in prayer during the local observance; and

Whereas, the Bielarussian Coordinating Committee will sponsor an exhibit in the Richard Daley Center from March 25 through 29 featuring cultural, social, politi-

cal and educational materials about Bielarus and its folk arts, crafts and culture:

Now, therefore, I, Harold Washington, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim March 25, 1985 to be "Bielarussian Independence Day" in Chicago and urge all citizens to be cognizant of the contributions of the Bielarussian people to the world and the special events arranged for this time.

This year also marks the 500th anniversary of the birth of Dr. Francisak Skaryna, the first translator and publisher of the Bible in the Bielarussian language.

The impact of Skaryna's monumental work from 1517-19 has been influential both in the cultural development of Bielarus and in the Bielarussian patriotic movement in the 20th century. Although the life of Francisak Skaryna is a legitimate subject of scholarly research, the republication of Skaryna's historic translation of the Bible is prohibited by authorities in Soviet occupied Bielarus. Since very few copies of this publication have been preserved, this work is virtually unavailable to the people of Bielarus, and therefore, they are unable to worship in their own language.

On this occasion of the 67th anniversary of Bielarus, I especially want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of Michal Kukabaka, as well as other Bielarussian dissidents and Prisoners of Conscience. Michal Kukabaka has been missing since late last year, when he was supposed to be released from a Soviet prison, and currently his whereabouts are unknown which has caused great concern to the Bielarus community. Many Bielarussians desiring only to have their children educated in their native Bielarus language, to practice their own religion, and to preserve their cultural heritage have been put into jails, psychiatric asylums, and forced labor camps by the Soviets.

The Soviets have been brutal in their attempts to make the Bielarussian people forget their past, their history, their culture, and their language. The Communists have written new books, manufactured a new culture, and have tried to invent a new history for the Bielarussian people, in an attempt to liquidate this proud people and their nation. Organizations, like the Bielarussian Coordinating Committee of Chicago, have joined hands with their brothers and sisters in Bielarus to defeat the Communists in their attempts, and today the courageous men and women of Bielarus continue to oppose the efforts of the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has benefited tremendously from the courage, creativity, and vitality of Bielarussian Americans. These citizens are a living symbol to the world of what the atmosphere of freedom can do to add to the greatness of a nation. I am proud to participate in the 67th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Bielarus and I extend my best

wishes to those Americans of Bielarussian descent, in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and Bielarussian Americans in Chicago and all over our Nation, who are commemorating this stirring event in the history of freedom. ●

#### THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of attending the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County's annual program to commemorate the 67th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. I deeply respect the pride and determination of the entire Lithuanian American Council for their fight for independence. I would like in particular to commend the president of the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Albert Vinick, for his hard work and dedication in fostering America's sense of duty to the Lithuanian people.

The Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, IN has adopted the following resolution in support of the freedom of their brothers and sisters in Lithuania, which I introduce into the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION

The Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Indiana, in a meeting duly assembled on the 17th day of February 1985, seriously discussed and unanimously passed a resolution pertaining to and pointing out the serious need to commemorate the restoration of Lithuanian Independence do hereby state as follows:

Whereas, that February 17, 1985, marks the 67th Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State.

Whereas, that Lithuania was recognized as a free and independent nation by the entire free world. She was a member of the League of Nations; however, she was by force and fraud occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union.

Whereas, that the Soviet invaders, even though using tortures in jails, concentration camps, psychiatric wards are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-government and the exercise of their rights to self-determination, as is highly evident from the numerous underground press and strong dissident activities.

Resolve, That the members of the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Indiana, are grateful to President Reagan and the Department of State for statements that an official diplomatic non-recognition of the forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R. of the three Baltic nations will continue to be a position of his Administration.

Resolve, To urge and to seek the aid of our representatives in the Congress of the United States of America and other nations

of the free world to use diplomatic and other possible pressures that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, secret police apparatus, foreign administration, and release from jails, concentration camps and psychiatric wards people who struggle for human rights and liberty and restore self-government in Lithuania.

*Resolve.* To express our most sincere gratitude to the U.S. Congress for the impressive annual commemoration of Lithuanian Independence. ●

## THE ANGEL OF DEATH—ON THE TRAIL OF MENGELE

### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, Art Harris writes a gripping mosaic in the Washington Post of March 8 on the Nazi "Angel of Death," Josef Mengele. It is a story that should be read by all Americans, particularly in view of the rise of some lunatic neo-Nazi groups in parts of the United States. The story of the monster Mengele is clearly one that deserves to be much more widely known.

#### ON THE TRAIL OF MENGELE

SEEN BUT NOT FOUND, SOUGHT BUT NOT CAUGHT: WHERE IS THE NAZI DOCTOR OF DEATH?

(By Art Harris)

Tales of the Angel of Death, told over and over: they come from Auschwitz, from the jungles of South America, from CIA files, from fevered Nazi-struck imaginations, from hucksters of hellish relics. Somehow, they are all different, but all the same.

Take the woman in the jewelry store in Asunción, Paraguay. She told an Israeli official about the day in 1965 when a customer asked about some merchandise. She came around the counter. She saw Josef Mengele. Two decades before, trim and elegant in his sleek black SS uniform, he had personally dispatched 400,000 other Jews to the ovens with a flick of his black-gloved wrist. But not her. She's survived. And now he was browsing in her jewelry store, just one of 40,000 Germans living in Paraguay.

She could not speak, she would say later. She watched him leave and then she told her husband: "It was him. It was Mengele."

For 40 years, one of the monsters of history has wandered the globe untouched, a free man: the most notorious Nazi war criminal believed alive today, the Auschwitz doctor whose mass murders and grisly experiments evoke Evil Incarnate.

How can this be?

West Germany has had a warrant out for his arrest for 26 years and has added a \$350,000 reward. Israel Nazi hunters spirited Adolf Eichmann out of Argentina, but others have missed Mengele, they say, by minutes at a Paraguayan hotel, by little more at the Rome airport. CIA informants put him in Brazil, in Chile, in the drug trade or working as an auto mechanic. German prosecutors believe he may have been in Paraguay as late as 1982, if a jailed drug suspect can be believed: He is said to have been Mengele's roommate outside Asunción, where they shared a passion for beekeeping.

What's more, the sightings began as soon as the Third Reich fell. American GIs say

they saw him in an Army prison; a German professor claims he interviewed Mengele at a British prison camp in 1947. After that Mengele lived in his home town in Bavaria, where his family had made its fortune in the farm machinery business. His name arose at the Nuremberg war-crime trials, and he fled to Rome, where he is said to have gotten papers under the name of Gregorio Gregori.

In either 1949 or 1951, according to conflicting reports, he sailed from Italy to Argentina, where he lived under his own name in Buenos Aires, hawking heavy equipment for the family firm. Neighbors say he was "quiet, distinguished and courteous."

As Dr. Helmut Gregor, one of the dozen aliases he adopted over the years, he became an Argentine citizen in 1954 and performed abortions, says Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal. (At one point, he was "detained" by police when a patient died.) His first wife divorced him that year, and in 1958 he married his older brother's widow. They were divorced three years later, and she left for Switzerland and Italy. After the West German warrant was issued in 1959 he became a Paraguayan citizen; he is said to have attended his father's funeral in Germany that year.

He has lived his life. He has had friends, patients, family. Now bounty hunters, revenge seekers, glory hounds and die-hard believers in earthly justice descend on South America in such numbers that they have fostered a trade in relics of this saint of Hell—photographs, an ID card, whatever souvenir of evil you want, except the man himself.

If alive, he would be 74 this month.

Now America wants him. Its top Nazi hunter, Neal Sher, a Justice Department lawyer who heads the Office of Special Investigations, flew to Europe last week to seek leads from German prosecutors and Nazi trackers like Wiesenthal, 76, who suspect Mengele is still in Paraguay, protected by President Alfredo Stroessner; but after all these years, they still don't really know.

On his SS application, he said he stood 5 feet 9, with brown hair and blue eyes. But others remember a shorter, darker-looking man in a country that worshipped blue-eyed blonds. Mengele's hang-up was that he "looked like a Gypsy," says Wiesenthal.

Indeed, he aimed to keep nature from future mistakes, drafting human guinea pigs for macabre experiments he believed might make Hitler's dream of an Aryan master race come true. As the SS doctor at Auschwitz, he dispatched nearly half a million to the gas chambers and killed thousands more with mad genetic quackery.

He was obsessed with twins: if German women could repopulate after the war with multiple births, military losses might be offset. He handpicked specimens as they came off the trains at Auschwitz-Birkenau deep inside Poland. In his black SS uniform, shiny stick in hand, he cut a striking figure to the bedraggled, frightened Jews, waving some to the left, to die, others to the right, to live.

"He looked gorgeous," recalls twin Eva Kor, 50, who sells real estate in Terre Haute, Ind. "But everyone was scared of him. He decided how long you lived."

One 12-year-old Jewish boy held a special fascination: Marc Berkowitz had blond hair, blue eyes and a twin sister, Francesca. SS officers on the lookout for lab rats perked up when their mother shouted, "Kill me, but not my twins!" Immediately, they were brought to Mengele, and the experiments began.

Berkowitz was ordered to disrobe and lie on a table. Fluid was drawn from his spine. "My whole body was burning, and the next thing I knew I was fighting back fainting," recalls the 53-year-old retired New York furniture salesman, physically disabled from his days at Auschwitz. He heard a whimper and reached out to comfort his sister. She lay on the next table.

At times, Mengele was almost gentle. He patted Berkowitz on the head as a nurse mopped his brow. Sometimes, he even apologized. "I'm sorry we have to do this, but the pain will go away," he said.

Yet if his "guinea pigs passed out, or fought back, he eliminated them," says Berkowitz, who watched bloody bundles carried out of the lab. Ever stoic, Berkowitz fought to detach himself from the pain, and did as he was told. Once, he stood on his head for hours without passing out. He was prodded, punctured and poked. He was dunked in a steel vat of freezing water while Mengele lab technicians monitored his plummeting body temperature.

At last, when he was pulled out alive, Mengele strutted about the lab in ecstasy. He liked Berkowitz's attitude. "You're the type of boy I've been looking for," he said. "You're setting an example. The other children are behaving themselves. We're getting good results."

Berkowitz just tried to obey, intent on living from "moment to moment, second to second." So pleased was the doctor with his star guinea pig that he made Berkowitz his "lauper," or errand boy. He taught him German songs, recited poetry. Mengele loved classical music, and Berkowitz hand-cranked his Victrola, shined his boots and harvested his brussels sprouts.

But Mengele's moods changed like the weather. One day, Berkowitz watched him shoot a boy, first in one knee, then in the other. The boy was weeping as Mengele grabbed him by the hair and gave him the coup de grace with a bullet in the brain. His sin: he'd wandered away from his barracks.

"You know he had no business over there," said Mengele. He asked Berkowitz if he'd done "something wrong" in shooting the boy, but didn't wait for an answer. "You have to respect the laws of the place," he said.

All the time, the crematoriums were running. Twins who survived the experiments were spared, of course, treated like prize pet rabbits. But if one in a pair died, Mengele killed the other to compare autopsies.

In other experiments, he snatched babies from mothers and tried to change the color of their eyes and hair, then killed them by injection. "What's the difference if you make black eyes out of blue eyes?" he asked one mother, then tried it with her child. It died.

Witnesses have also told German prosecutors:

He offered candy to two sets of twin girls, then shot them in the neck, castrated or sterilized "about 100 male prisoners," routinely tossed babies into ovens alive and wired inmates with electrodes to test their threshold for electric shock.

To boost his labor force, he ordered pregnant women onto their backs, then stomped them until they aborted. Once, he promised a special milk porridge for all expectant mothers who signed up, then gassed them all. He also gassed a barracks that included some of his former professors, all Jews.

"We called him the 'death doctor,'" says survivor Ernest Michel, 61, of New York City, who once escorted eight Jewish women

to Mengele's lab as an orderly. When he hauled them away, two were dead, two were in a coma, another had to be disconnected from an electroshock machine.

Spared for his elegant penmanship, Michel was ordered to rewrite medical history. "Heart attack," he wrote day after day to cover up the true cause of death. "Our biggest fear was that no one would be left alive to tell what really happened," he says.

As one of Mengele's pets, Berkowitz was there in 1944 when his keeper exploded over a report of lice among the Gypsies. "I'm sick and tired of these filthy, diseased pigs," Mengele ranted. "I've been trying to keep this camp clean, and I'm fighting a losing battle!"

His solution: send the whole barracks to the gas chambers, and 700 Gypsies were marched off to be "disinfected" forever. One German officer nodded at Berkowitz, a witness to his rage. Said Mengele, "Don't worry, he's one of us. If we had more boys like him, we would have won the war."

Mengele liked to test Berkowitz, probing for the secret of his endurance. Once, he ordered Berkowitz to swim with the SS men who nearly drowned him for sport. To retest his courage, it was back to the pool.

When his mother's barracks was marched off to the gas chamber, Mengele conjured an errand so Berkowitz could take a last talk with Helen Berkowitz. For Mengele, it was just another experiment, the Angel of Death testing the faith of a Jew.

"So," asked Mengele later, "do you still believe in God?"

"I've lost almost everything," replied Berkowitz, "but one thing I have not lost is God. You can take everything from me, but you cannot take my God."

Mengele reached for his revolver. It was holstered in black leather, hanging over a chair. He unsnapped one button. He unsnapped the other. He stared long and hard at his gofer.

"You gave the right answer," he said. He nodded at his boots. "I want a good shine today. I have very important things to tend to."

Berkowitz walked outside. Smoke was belching thick and black. He was thinking, "I'm only 12, but I'd better say Kaddish (the prayer for the dead) for my mother. I don't know if I'll be around to say it tomorrow."

Our Christmas Eve 1944, with the Russians advancing on the eastern front, Mengele found Berkowitz in the washroom. A light snow was falling. Pausing at the door, flanked by two SS guards, he wished him well. Mengele seemed almost wistful. "Adieu," he said. And that was the last time Berkowitz saw him.

Everyone has an answer, a rumor, a theory, a cold lead, an excuse.

"I've [barely] missed him five times," says Wiesenthal. He has bagged 1,100 war criminals in his lifetime without ever getting as close to Mengele as the jeweler's wife.

Christmas 1963. Wiesenthal got tipped off in a letter: Mengele, Hotel American, Milan. He flew there with a German prosecutor. Said the manager, "Yesterday, he left." In Torremolinos, Spain, he missed him by two days; at the Rome airport, by mere hours.

Later, a group of Auschwitz avengers called the "Committee of 12" tracked him to the Hotel Tyrol near the thriving German colony of Hohenau in eastern Paraguay. They planned to spirit him to Frankfurt to stand trial. His alias that time: Dr. Fritz Fischer. They burst into room 26, but he was gone. Minutes before, Herr Fischer got

a phone call, said the manager, raced down the stairs with his pajamas on under his suit, and vanished in the night.

Intelligence tips put Mengele in Chile 18 months ago; in Paraguay's German-speaking Mennonite villages on the Bolivian border as recently as last year; in Uruguay six months ago.

South American governments, rubbed raw by complaints that they're sheltering the fled legions of the Nazis, deny it all.

Says the Chilean Embassy press officer: "We had one Nazi war criminal, and that was plenty." That would have been the late Walter Rauff, the SS general who conceived and operated mobile gas chambers used to exterminate Jews. He recently died in his sleep after running a fishing boat for years, under his own name, out of Puerto Provenir. Chile's supreme court denied his extradition request on a technicality. Another extradition request was denied in 1959 by Argentina, on grounds that it was written in German, not Spanish. And not till 1970 did Paraguay concede Mengele had been naturalized years before.

"The last photograph is 1963 in Asuncion," says Wiesenthal by phone from Vienna. "We don't know his [new] alias."

What of rumors he may have undergone plastic surgery? Wiesenthal doubts it; no Nazi war criminal he caught ever went under the knife. What about the report of postcards sent to friends from Portugal? Does Wiesenthal say this is a Nazi disinformation trick to blur the trail?

Or CIA files portraying Mengele as a cocaine warlord, dealing under the name Dr. Henrique Wollman? "A stupid story," Wiesenthal scoffs. "He doesn't need the money."

It would certainly seem that way, if he can rely on rich Nazi friends and the family conglomerate, Karl Mengele & Sons, with offices in Paraguay, Argentina and the United States.

A \$1 million bounty was offered last week by unnamed donors in Los Angeles after lesser amounts did no good.

He remains at bay, a fugitive with all the glamour of an emissary from hell, merely yapped at by the hounds of justice, and mythologized by Hollywood in two movies, "Marathon Man" and "The Boys From Brazil."

Mengele was born March 16, 1911, in Guenzburg, Germany, the third son of a wealthy farm machinery manufacturer. At 24, he joined Hitler's "Brown Shirts," the Nazi Party three years later.

He studied anthropology and zoology in Munich, hatching a fascination for genetics, which was further fueled at the Institute for Genetic Purification in Frankfurt. In 1938, he graduated from medical school, married Irene Maria Schoenbein, joined the Waffen SS and became the Auschwitz camp physician.

Their son Rolf was born at Auschwitz in 1944.

Like other Nazis in the early days after the war, he made little effort to hide his identity.

But at least two U.S. Army veterans say they believe he was in U.S. custody at one time. A retired California aerospace engineer, Walter Kempthorne, says soldiers put a redfaced prisoner through calisthenics around July 10, 1945.

"This here's the bastard who sterilized 3,000 women at Auschwitz," said one, as a man fitting Mengele's description huffed and puffed. Kempthorne was 19, a private at the Idar-Oberstein detention camp in oc-

cupied Germany, where Nazis were interrogated after the war.

Guards sometimes trotted them outside for fun and games, including a charade called "Luftwaffe": Prisoners were ordered to run around in circles "spitting like a plane," says Richard Schwarz, 59, a retired government labor lawyer in Washington, D.C. As a young private, he put a Nazi he now believes was Mengele through the drill, "pats on the fanny" and all.

"Presumably, it was Mengele," recalls Schwarz, who never heard the man's name, but has war correspondence indicating he wrote friends about just such a doctor. And the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, which hunts data on Nazi war criminals and supports Holocaust studies, turned up the two soldiers, along with a U.S. Army dispatch from an intelligence officer who refers to an account of Mengele's arrest in 1947.

"We're searching our records of that camp," says Lt. Col. Craig McNab, an Army spokesman. "You've got to understand, Mengele wasn't on top of anyone's list back then. In 1945, he was a doctor way off in the wilds of Poland."

And by the 1950s, he was long gone. In South America, the chase began, a slow and frustrating pursuit. Diplomatic channels yielded nothing. Everything grew vague.

Isser Harel, Israel's secret service chief who pulled off the daring snatch of Eichmann from Buenos Aires in 1960, eyed Mengele, too, but didn't want to risk losing Eichmann, he once wrote. Afterwards, Israeli agents tracked down his house in a middle-class suburb of Buenos Aires, but he was gone. They traced him to Paraguay. There, it was believed, he was protected by President Alfredo Stroessner, the right-wing strong man who took power in 1954, son of an immigrant German cavalry officer. It was easy to hide in a remote California-size country with only two million people and a gossipy capital where word travels fast when outsiders come sniffing around.

There was also plenty of camouflage from German colonies to the east, where lush, rolling hills between the Paraguay and Parana rivers lured refugees of the Third Reich to drive Mengele tractors around some of the world's most fertile subtropical farmland.

It was there Mengele was sighted in the '60s, from Pedro Juan Caballero, a coffee-growing town to the north, to Hohenau, a farming village to the south. Israeli agents staked out a hideout in a heavily fortified farmhouse nearby in the early '60s, but ruled out a commando raid. There was no airport nearby to pull off an Entebbe, and Israel couldn't afford any diplomatic casualties: the Eichmann affair has ended their honeymoon.

Agents kept up their search in Asuncion and the interior, then lost Mengele across the border in Brazil, according to heavily edited CIA files released last week. Accounts also surfaced of assorted avengers on the loose, and someone apparently mistook a man for Mengele. He was found beaten to death, but it turned out to be an ex-Nazi soldier.

Diplomacy offered another route for frustration. When West Germany's envoy protested in 1965 that Mengele's citizenship was invalid, Stroessner is said to have exploded in rage. "Once a Paraguayan always a Paraguayan!" he shouted, pounding the table.

Especially when the citizenship papers are signed by old Stroessner friends like Alejan-

dro von Eckstein, a Russian emigre who fought alongside Stroessner in the Chaco War with Bolivia, and who still advises Paraguayan intelligence services.

At the American Embassy at Asuncion, there were frequent rumors of Martin Bormann alive and well, but never Mengele, recalls A. Dane Bowen, political officer until 1964. Besides: "Hunting Nazi war criminals wasn't our big preoccupation."

In those days, Mengele lived openly, sunning at a villa a half-mile from the embassy and scouting for land in Alta Parana, just across the Argentine border, reportedly working as an auto mechanic northeast of Asuncion near the Brazilian border. "Recurring rumors" said that Mengele was at a "well-guarded ranch, either near Encarnacion, in eastern Paraguay, or in Chaco, and that he is protected by Stroessner," said a 1972 CIA report.

Veterans of the Asuncion diplomatic corps say Mengele socialized with later Nazi Luftwaffe ace Hans Ulrich-Rudel reputed mastermind of Odessa, the secret underground that resettled fleeing Nazis in South America. Rudel was a fixture at diplomatic receptions, a favorite of Stroessner, and a representative for German firms.

His dealings also included substantial payments to Stroessner's son, says Paris-based Nazi hunter Beate Klarsfeld, who, along with her husband, tracked Nazi war criminal Klaus Altman Barbie to Bolivia, where he lived openly as a government security consultant before his extradition to France. She claims Rudel's financial documents, in her files, detail the deals.

"I bumped into Rudel all over the place," says Benjamin Weiser Varone, 71, the former Israeli ambassador who made it a habit to befriend those like the jeweler's wife who had seen Mengele. He met Mengele's lawyer, dutifully filing such reports to Tel Aviv. He got no reply.

"Israel doesn't expect its ambassadors to be Nazi hunters," he says. But whenever Nazi hunters back home raised a fuss, Paraguayan officials called Varone on the carpet. "They would call me to express the displeasure of their president," says the retired diplomat turned writer, who lives in Brookline, Mass. "But they never denied he was there."

Naturally, Varone was a magnet for mercenaries and crackpots chasing the doctor. His standard line: "Go across the street. The Germans have a warrant for his arrest." His job was to keep Paraguay's crucial U.N. Security Council vote in Israel's corner. He charmed, he cajoled, he got it, even as Mengele was seen around town.

Later, in 1978, the U.S. Embassy heard he frequented the Caballo Blanco, or White Horse, a favorite German restaurant downtown. And a BBC crew with a hidden mike captured a Nazi boasting of playing cards with the doctor.

"Mengele? Oh, yes, he's around, but we don't know quite where. He comes and goes," officials would reply whenever Ambassador Robert White brought it up.

So, why wasn't he arrested—or something? "Because he wasn't wanted all that much," says White, who filed his Mengele tales with the State Department and got no reply. "We did report on it, but there was never much interest expressed by Washington in any way."

Still, such accounts irritated officials in the remote haven for rightwing refugees. "Bob, how can we polish up our image?" he was often asked.

His whereabouts has mystified them since 1962, when Germany's first extradition re-

quest arrived. But if a hideout can be found, they promise to dispatch a posse. "We have made a full investigation and found no trace of Mengele in Paraguay," says the embassy press attache. "We believe he is not there anymore."

Horrors like the Holocaust make Everyone a philosopher. Questions beget more questions. If Mengele is never caught, does that mean you can do unspeakable things in this life and escape justice? Or if he is put on trial, will that mean good finally triumphed over evil?

On Jan. 27, 1945, Berkowitz and his sister were liberated by the Russians, after surviving a death march in the freezing cold. And three years later, after stints in refugee camps, they wound up in America, sole survivors of a family of nine.

Berkowitz washed dishes in New York, sold furniture, shrugged off the pain of a crumbling spine and fought to understand. With Eva Kor, he started a support group for Auschwitz twins called Candles. So far, about 120 have come forward, 20 from the States. Many testified at a mock trial for Mengele in Jerusalem last month.

If Mengele is ever arrested, Berkowitz wants to ask him some questions. "I would like to ask him exactly what he did to his guinea pigs, so we can get medical help," he says. "We are like a puzzle. We have to be put back together piece by piece."

Ambivalent about revenge, he would prefer a trial. He doesn't hate Mengele. And he reflects that he is still his errand boy: "You see, he never dismissed me."

Says Wiesenthal: "Look, the life of Mengele is without importance. After so many years, criminals turn into witnesses. How can you punish somebody for the deaths of 400,000 people? If he is caught and gets life, he'll probably serve only a few years before he dies. That will end up to be a few seconds per victim."

But if Mengele is sent to the gallows, "the survivors should do it," says Berkowitz.

Now Mengele is hot, everyone's favorite villain. It's only taken 40 years. In South America, there are those who can look on it as a trend, not unlike other trends, a sort of nostalgia craze.

"There are people out there willing to sell you Bormann's bones and Mengele's hacienda," says New York lawyer Gerald Posner, whose research forays draw Nazi brokers like flies. "The minute they hear an American is hunting Nazis, their ears perk up and their wallets get itchy."

He's spurned diaries, rings and memorabilia. How about Mengele's original fingerprint card? asked a Brazilian cop. Only \$500. Or recent photos, whispered an ex-Nazi officer over mint tea at the Hotel Mansour in Casablanca—after plastic surgery. A mere five grand. Or, maybe you like Mengele's SS ring, very cheap: \$1,000, said the Argentine lawyer.

The flea market sells such rings by the trayful, swastika and all, \$3 apiece. ●

#### CUT OFF PRIVATE AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I and Congressman LEACH are introducing legislation to

amend the Neutrality Act to prohibit private assistance for military or paramilitary operations in a foreign country if the Congress has prohibited the use of covert assistance for such operations.

This legislation will establish the sound principle that once Congress enacts clear foreign policy legislation, it must not be undermined by private citizens conducting a contrary foreign policy. The immediate impact of our legislation would be to prohibit private assistance to the Contras in Nicaragua.

From 1981 to the summer of 1984 the United States provided some \$80 million in aid to the Contras. The House has voted three times to cut off such aid, and the 1985 continuing resolution contains provisions cutting off aid to the Contras.

Last fall reports began appearing in the media of increasing private assistance to the Contras. Spokesmen for the groups providing this assistance have acknowledged that private American funding assists Contra military operations in training and at base camps. Other reports have suggested a pattern of broader operations, including American assistance in combat. Reports revealed that private aid to the Contras might be as high as \$17 million over the past year.

This has become a matter of deep concern to me. Existing law, through the Neutrality Act, prohibits support of or participation in military expeditions against foreign governments that are at peace with the United States. The intent of the act is that the United States not be the site of conspiracies and preparations for attacks against foreign countries with whom the United States is at peace. Although private assistance to the Contras could well be a violation of current law, this administration has chosen to look the other way, interpreting the law quite narrowly.

Instead, President Reagan has been using very tough language about the Sandinistas. He has referred to the Contras as "freedom fighters struggling for liberty and democracy," and as "the moral equivalent of our Founding Fathers." Yet, two separate reports issued this month, one by the Washington Office on Latin America with the International Human Rights Law Group, and another by Americas Watch, described a distinct pattern of human rights violations by the Contras that include attacks on civilian targets resulting to the killing of unarmed men, women, children and the elderly; premeditated acts of brutality including rape, beatings, mutilation and torture; individual and mass kidnapping of civilians; assaults on economic and social targets such as farms, cooperatives, food storage facilities, and health centers; and kidnapping,

intimidation and even murder of religious leaders who support the government.

In voting to cut off covert aid to the Contras, Congress has clearly established American policy on this issue. By attempting to send private aid to the Contras, private individuals and groups are doing nothing less than thwarting the will of Congress.

The Congress has valid national security interests in insuring the success of its policy. It has made a key decision in the area of foreign affairs and it has the constitutional prerogative to do so. In cutting off aid to the Contras, Congress has validly exercised one of its most significant foreign policy powers, the power of the purse.

Once Congress has acted in a clear and unmistakable fashion in the area of foreign policy, it contravenes American interests at home and abroad to allow private citizens to conduct their own individual foreign policies which undermine congressional intent. This legislation would put an end to that practice.

This is an important bill, and I hope many of my colleagues will cosponsor it.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 1569

A Bill to prohibit private assistance for military or paramilitary operations in a foreign country if the Congress has prohibited the use of covert assistance for such operations

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. PRIVATE ASSISTANCE FOR MILITARY OR PARAMILITARY OPERATIONS IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES OR FOR DESIGNATED INTERNATIONAL TERRORISTS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS ON CERTAIN PRIVATE ASSISTANCE.—Chapter 45 of title 18, United States Code, relating to foreign relations, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

§ 971. Private assistance for military or paramilitary operations in certain countries

“(a) PROHIBITION.—Whoever, being a person described in subsection (d) of this section, furnishes any money, goods, or services with the intent of assisting any group to engage in military or paramilitary operations in a designated foreign country shall be punished under subsection (e) of this section.

“(b) ATTEMPTS.—Whoever, being a person described in subsection (d) of this section, attempts to engage in the conduct prohibited by subsection (a) of this section shall be punished under subsection (e) of this section.

“(c) DESIGNATED FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A foreign country is a designated foreign country for purposes of this section if there is a statutory prohibition on United States covert assistance for the purpose of supporting military or paramilitary operations in that country.

“(2) DEFINITION OF STATUTORY PROHIBITION.—As used in this section, the term ‘statutory prohibition’ means a prohibition enacted by the Congress which is in effect when the violation of this section occurs.

“(3) DEFINITION OF COVERT ASSISTANCE.—As used in this section, the term ‘United States

covert assistance’ means assistance provided by the Central Intelligence Agency or any other agency or entity of the United States Government involved in intelligence activities (regardless of whether the prohibition specifically refers to any such agency).

“(d) PERSONS COVERED.—A person is covered by this section if—

“(1) that person engages in any conduct in the United States in the furtherance of an offense described in this section; or

“(2) that person is a United States citizen regardless of where the conduct prohibited by this section occurs.

“(e) PENALTY.—Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than \$250,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 45 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

“971. Private assistance for military or paramilitary operations in certain countries.”●

### CONGRESS SHOULD PROHIBIT GREENMAIL

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, few business phenomena have attracted the volume of mass-media attention as has the subject of hostile takeovers.

Just about every major newspaper and news magazine have published newstories and indepth features on the corporations and individuals involved in the takeovers. The proliferation of takeovers has raised serious questions about the impact of takeovers on the national economy, credit markets, the employees of the target companies, and the community in which the acquired corporations have operations.

As a defense to hostile takeovers, the boards of target corporations have increasingly relied upon the practice of “greenmail,” the repurchase at a substantial above-market premium of the target shares held by the bidder/raider in the takeover.

The practice depletes target treasuries, provides the raiders who are minority shareholders with an opportunity denied other shareholders, and encourages further takeover attempts in the hope that future targets will be forced to make greenmail payments.

William C. Norris, chairman and chief executive officer of the Control Data Corp., headquartered in Minneapolis, MN, is one of the leaders among corporate executives speaking out against the practice of greenmail. The New York Times of Sunday, March 3, presented a compelling, concise case against greenmail and in favor of congressional action to prohibit greenmail. I urge my colleagues to consider the carefully thoughtout views of Mr. Norris and to join with

me and many of our colleagues in scrutinizing the practice of greenmail as we consider the need for Federal legislation to regulate, and possibly prohibit, this practice.

The New York Times article follows:  
[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1985]

ENOUGH GREENMAIL  
(By William C. Norris)

On a recent visit to New York, I picked up a newspaper and discovered in the business section that my company might be the target of a takeover attempt. It caught my attention. But it was no surprise.

Control Data, like almost every company in America, no matter how large, is vulnerable to the tidal wave of hostile takeovers that we have seen in recent years. Some may find this ironic. For more than 10 years, as a critic of corporate raiders, stock-market speculators, opportunistic bankers, lawyers, arbitrageurs and other power-hungry players in the real-money monopoly game of hostile takeovers, I have argued that such takeovers loot corporate treasuries, cheat shareholders and undermine our ability to compete in world markets. I have warned that they lead to the misuse of capital; force management to sacrifice long-term strategy and the development of new products and services for short-term gains; inhibit innovation, and cause job losses and economic upheaval that disrupt the lives of employers and communities.

Nobody seems to have paid much attention. Last year, for example, a record number of companies repurchased their own shares. Many did so as a defensive measure against real or implied takeover threats, paying a higher-than-market price to buy back stock from an unwanted suitor and thereby coining a new word in the corporate lexicon—“greenmail,” a form of legalized banditry that has mainly rewarded its practitioners.

The inescapable conclusion is that hostile takeovers are undermining our economic system and our competitiveness. But there is some ray of hope: statutes enacted at the state level, including Ohio and Minnesota. The most important component of the Minnesota law is a requirement that the acquiring company publicly disclose its plans and goals for the target company, its employees and the communities in which they live. This is obviously a critical requirement in unwanted takeovers. But I also believe that even in the case of friendly combinations, the acquisition should not be consummated if the negative aspects of the takeover cannot be resolved in an economically and socially acceptable manner.

What we need now is Federal reform along the same lines: a national response to the economic and social damage caused by hostile takeovers.

The damage is real. Recently, for example, a New Jersey company called Edudata tried to take over a Minnesota company called Scientific Computers. Scientific Computers had about 250 employees and earned \$1.2 million on sales of \$14.9 million in fiscal 1984. Edudata, by contrast, had few employees, virtually no track record and had been losing money. In another case, Cardiff Acquisitions came after Conwed, a Minnesota-based forest products company.

Both of these takeover attempts would have succeeded had it not been for the Minnesota law, a law promoted by business, labor, academe and state government, and upheld by Federal district and appellate

courts. Cardiff, for example, failed in its first attempt to acquire Conwed. It later succeeded, but only after raising its bid by one-third.

Yet even with the aid of the new law, companies can pay dearly to remain independent. Take Scientific Computers. Before the raid, the company had little debt and a healthy cash reserve of \$3.7 million. But it ultimately paid \$6.4 million to buy back stock held by Edudata and affiliates, plus \$500,000 in attorneys' fees, by borrowing \$4 million and taking the rest from cash reserves.

In a sense, therefore, Scientific Computers won. But even in losing, Edudata made off with a big haul of cash, and the lawyers got their cut. And there were hundreds of small losers. The long-term stockholders of Scientific Computers got clobbered. As a result of the cash paid out, and the reduced earning power of the company, their shares are now worth less. The company's employees lost because their employer was left with decreased resources with which to compete in the marketplace. Finally, the community and state lost—for the reasons cited here and because capital was removed from the state.

The need for a law requiring a raider to disclose his intentions seems obvious, but it's driven home when you read, as I did, a letter from an employee of another Minnesota target of a hostile takeover attempt. The employee asked why dedicated workers who had invested both money and lives in the company were not entitled to an explanation of the raider's plans for their futures. The answer: we cannot responsibly ignore the devastating effects of corporate raids on employees, communities and the future vitality of the company itself.

Moreover, if we fail to respond quickly and sensibly, public outrage will lead to punitive and inflexible legislation. Before this happens, Congress should enact a law that inhibits hostile takeovers while assuring some flexibility for friendly mergers and acquisitions, which can be critically important to our competitive strength.

The recently enacted Minnesota law is a good place to start. In the meantime, as I have made clear whenever asked about a takeover rumor, "Anyone who tries to take over Control Data will be in for a world-class fight." ●

**TONY OLIVA RETURNS TO THE TWINS**

**HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO**  
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit the following article for the RECORD on behalf of my good friend, Tony Oliva. Tony, who was one of the best baseball players that I have ever seen, is back in a Minnesota Twins uniform as a coach and batting instructor. The people in Minnesota and all baseball fans are glad to see that Tony has returned to the big leagues.

Tony Oliva played baseball as few others could. He led the American League in batting average in his first two seasons in the major leagues and won a total of three batting crowns in

his first eight seasons. He also led the American League in base hits in five of his first eight seasons. Unfortunately for Tony and baseball, serious knee injuries plagued him during his final five seasons. Were it not for those injuries, Tony Oliva would be a shoo-in for baseball's Hall of Fame.

I want to welcome my friend Tony Oliva back to the major leagues and honor him by entering the following article into the RECORD.

[From the Minneapolis (MN) Star & Tribune, Mar. 3, 1985]

**UNOBTRUSIVE OLIVA IS MAKING A HIT WITH TWINS**

(By Howard Sinker)

ORLANDO, FLA.—His presence is obvious without being threatening. Whenever there are Twins practicing their hitting, Tony Oliva can be found leaning against the back of the batting cage, bat in hand, offering tidbits.

The other day, for example, he found that Gary Gaetti's footwork was keeping him from pulling the ball. And that Dave Engle isn't aggressive enough when hitting to right field. And that Tim Laudner ought to shorten his stride or he'll "miss many beautiful pitches."

For Oliva, being the Twins' batting coach marks the return to a job he thought never should have been taken away. He was replaced after the 1978 season and spent the last six years as a minor league instructor, shuttling from Visalia to Toledo, from Kenosha to Orlando, trying to hone raw talent into major league hitters.

"I was disappointed. If you don't do the job, you shouldn't belong there. But I was doing the job," Oliva said. "The three years I coached, the Twins were always (doing well) in hitting. Plus, I'd been in Minnesota for so many years and didn't want to leave. But what would have happened if I don't say that I'll go? I wouldn't have a job."

The story, according to former owner Calvin Griffith, was that Oliva, 43, left the Twins at the insistence of then-manager Gene Mauch. "He wanted to have his own people, which I think is a fallacy," Griffith said. "I think the owner should dictate who the coaches are going to be."

Oliva said Griffith put the best possible face on what was happening. "Mr. Griffith said to me, 'Tony, I'm going to bring you back one day. But I need you to work with the younger ballplayers because we're not going to get free agents. You're the best one to help develop ballplayers.' I've developed a lot of the players who are here right now."

The players aren't complaining about having Oliva replace Jim Lemon, who will become the Twins' advance scout.

"Lemon definitely was a knowledgeable hitter who knew the basics real well," said first baseman Kent Hrbek. "But I don't think he knew how to explain them that well. I can understand Tony. Not English-wise all the time. But I can understand his approach to hitting better."

"Tony works with what you've got. He doesn't try to change you and make you into a different hitter. We've all gotten here somehow. Tony just tries to make certain minor adjustments instead of trying to teach an old dog new tricks. There's only so much a guy can tell you and Tony knows that."

Said Oliva: "You're not going to tell some guys what to do, no matter what. When you have a .300 hitter, you wait for him to come to you for advice."

That wisdom comes firsthand. Through a 13-year career that was shortened by knee injuries, Oliva had a .304 average and was the American League batting champ in 1964 (.323), 1965 (.321) and 1971 (.337). He remains the only player ever to win that title in his first two major league seasons.

At first, though, Griffith wondered how Oliva would make the transition to coaching. "Tony was the best hitter we ever had and that's what worried me for a while," he said. "He's such a natural, the kind of guy who could just go out there and hit the ball out of the park. And that could have been the trouble. A lot of the people with that kind of ability never had to go through the challenge of having to learn."

But to be a Twin in Oliva's days was to be surrounded by those who took their swings seriously. There were sluggers and hitters—and Oliva, who was both.

"In the early 1970s, we had a veteran team and everyone would help one another—Killebrew, Allison, Carew, Tovar," Oliva recalled. "They helped me. I helped them. Why? Because we were all good hitters. I felt that even before I started coaching, I was a good instructor."

In addition to coaching for the Twins, Oliva spent five winters managing teams in Mexico and Colombia. He found there that he was able to work with aspiring players as well as those who already were secure major leaguers.

There were those who wondered why Oliva stayed with the Twins' organization when he was sent to the minors. It appeared his career was being rewarded with a kick in the pants and, surely, some other team would welcome his services.

"I grew up in the Minnesota organization and all of the people here had treated me nicely," Oliva explained. "It's hard to go to a different organization. But if I hadn't believed they were going to give me this opportunity, I think I would have had a chance to go somewhere else two or three years ago. I could have gone if I had tried hard, but I never did. People would say to me, 'Tony, why don't you leave?' But there are many things that you have to take into consideration."

It was the Twins, after all, who helped Oliva get out of his native Cuba in 1961. At the time, the Twins had a scout in Cuba, Joe Cambria, who both discovered Oliva and discovered that he was too young to get a U.S. visa. A visa was acquired for an older brother, however, and Oliva used that to leave.

The Twins have made quite a return on that creative investment and are counting on getting even more. Manager Billy Gardner, himself no stranger to coaching in the minors, believes that background will be a boon to his players.

"At the minor league training camp, one of the things you could count on was that Tony would be at the batting cage," said Engle. "And almost every time he'd have a little something to say."

Said Oliva: "I don't want any body to hit like me, but I do want them to work that hard to improve themselves. We're going to be here for another five weeks and I'll take them aside and give them little things to do that will make it easier for them."

"I've seen a lot of good hitters and I know that when Rod Carew was hitting .340 and .350, he would still come out and do a lot of extra batting practice because maybe the day before he did something that he didn't like."

Such talk is foreign to Gardner, who never was much of an offensive threat. "I'm a little jealous," he said chuckling. "But I told Tony that if he was a .230 hitter like me, he wouldn't have his bad knees. He was on base too much. Too much running and sliding."

"If I was a .230 hitter" Oliva countered, "would I be doing this job?"

#### THE QUESTION OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM ADDRESSED

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of a brief conversation with Dr. Sukru Elekdag, the Turkish Ambassador to the United States. He told me that there exists today a substantial body of Marxist terrorists which exploits the tragedies of Armenian sufferings of 1915 as an excuse for the projection of today's Soviet imperialist purposes, including the proposed annexation of Turkish territory into Soviet control.

The Ambassador told me that House Joint Resolution 37, now pending in the House, might inadvertently give an excuse for terrorism against not only Turkish citizens today, but also against Americans and the NATO alliance as well. I asked the Ambassador to give me a memorandum in this and the following is what he sent to me, in part:

"Turkey, like the United States has been the prime target of international terrorist savagery which has become so much a part of the international landscape of the 1980's. Over 41 Turkish diplomats and their family members have been murdered by terrorist assassins in the past ten years. The death toll also includes numerous innocent bystanders of many nationalities, including U.S. citizens. In each instance, the terrorists have proclaimed as their pretext vengeance for the alleged genocide of their Armenian forebearers 70 years ago—before the terrorists' victims were born.

"Publicity for the terrorists' version of history has been their aim, and bloodshed their attention-getter. Our common cause in the effort to discourage international terrorism may be placed in jeopardy should such an eminent body as the U.S. Congress affirm, by the adoption of H.J. Res. 37 the alleged validity of the pretext for the assassination of innocents by the Armenian terrorists.

"One consideration in this matter should be uncontroversial. There is a need for a common front to counteract international terrorism. That need is unambiguous. We must do what is necessary to achieve it and refrain from actions that could preclude it."

#### EUGENE ORMANDY: HIS LEGACY IS A GREAT ORCHESTRA

### HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Eugene Ormandy at the age of 85 marks the end of a remarkable career for the Hungarian-born conductor whose genius in music brought international acclaim to the Philadelphia Orchestra.

To those of us from Philadelphia and environs, Mr. Ormandy embodied the qualities of excellence, class and taste that we associate with the city of Philadelphia. He honored and dignified the city with his leadership of a brilliant orchestra.

In his 44 years as the orchestra's music director, Mr. Ormandy set high standards. And he and his musicians lived up to them. For Mr. Ormandy, the role he assumed was no easy one. He followed the great Leopold Stokowski as conductor of the Philadelphia Orchestra.

While the reputation of Mr. Ormandy and the orchestra was recognized throughout the world, the organization first and foremost was Philadelphia's own. At least two generations of Philadelphia music lovers grew up with the Philadelphia Orchestra—many sharing dates in the upper balcony seats of the city's magnificent Academy of Music as the distinctive sounds of the orchestra filled the night.

Mr. Ormandy led a rich and full life. Surely he will be missed. The city of Philadelphia remains forever in his debt. Music lovers everywhere cherish the legacy he has left—a great orchestra, the Philadelphia Orchestra.

I insert this editorial from the March 14, 1985 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a lasting tribute to Mr. Ormandy:

#### MAESTRO EUGENE ORMANDY, A FABULOUS PHILADELPHIAN

His was a musical career the likes of which almost certainly will never be seen again. It began in imperial Austria-Hungary, began over again in New York pit orchestras, included dramatic last-minute-substitution debuts and, most remarkably, came to define symphonic music in Philadelphia for more than four decades. For millions of music lovers over two and three generations and across the world, Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra were synonymous, a special partnership of musical precision and beauty.

Maestro Ormandy first led the orchestra in 1930 at Robin Hood Dell and last was on its podium, in Carnegie Hall, New York, barely a year ago, Jan. 10, 1984, thus spanning almost two-thirds of the orchestra's existence. For 44 years he was music director, a tenure unmatched among major ensembles. By the time he relinquished the music directorship in 1980—stepping back, not

down, he would point out—he had appointed every single player.

Of course, he had not inherited some negligible band, rather the renowned orchestra built by Leopold Stokowski. To it Mr. Ormandy wedded his violinist technique and acute ear, producing "the Philadelphia Sound," in rich, round, lustrous and immediately recognizable to music lovers. The words greatest and best were often bestowed by critics and other musicians, and Riccardo Muti in 1980 took over a well-maintained orchestra.

The maestro and his musicians did fabulous things for Philadelphia—indeed this city has probably never had greater ambassadors. Through extensive tours, radio broadcasts and a plenitude of recordings, Mr. Ormandy gave to millions across the world an image of Philadelphia that was, not a W.C. Fields joke or a Lincoln Steffens shame, but a center of wondrous musical art. He carried the fame of Philadelphia to the musical capitals of Europe, to the Soviet Union in the 1950s, through South America and, in a mission of cultural diplomacy that still benefits the city, to China in 1973.

His ear and memory were legend—performances of modern works from memory after only an hour's study. When Vladimir Horowitz performed his 50th anniversary concert, his first appearance with an orchestra in 25 years, it was Eugene Ormandy he chose to conduct—because, Mr. Horowitz said, he was the best for the job.

Outstanding conductors and virtuoso orchestras are not unique, certainly, but as Maestro Ormandy's tenure here lengthened it became clear that his total dedication to Philadelphia and its orchestra was. While other conductors flitted from orchestra to orchestra, job-hopping and jetsetting, Mr. Ormandy stayed in his adopted city, nurturing and sustaining his ensemble. That was the style of a previous era; only Mr. Ormandy continued it.

It was a commitment that gave Philadelphia audiences a direct link to music making of the 19th century—Mr. Ormandy cited the influence of such greats as Willem Mengelberg, another romantic virtuoso who stayed with one orchestra more than 40 years, and he had a special friendship with Sergei Rachmaninoff, composer and pianist, who would perform with no other Americans than Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra. It was not, though, a commitment mired in the past. Along with Rachmaninoff, were important premieres of works by Walter Piston, Roger Sessions, Samuel Barber and Dmitri Shostakovich, and early on, when recordings were still somewhat crude, Mr. Ormandy was keen on perfecting radio broadcasts.

Philadelphia was immeasurably blessed to have had Eugene Ormandy. His legacy is the brilliant orchestra he shaped, and his legend has only to be shaped, and his legend has only begun to grow.

#### WELL-KNOWN ALUMNAE TO BE HONORED AT WELLESLEY COLLEGE

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important educational insti-

tutions in the United States, Wellesley College, is located within my congressional district. Wellesley has begun a program of honoring some of its many distinguished alumnae. I was particularly pleased recently to learn that two of those outstanding women who were receiving well-deserved honors are people who have gained part of their distinction by explaining our behavior to the American public. Cokie Roberts and Linda Wertheimer are among the best of the journalists who cover Congress. Their analytical skills, their ability to describe the most complex of our proceedings in straightforward and interesting ways, and the commitment that they have to the democratic process which informs their work make them very important individuals in the essential democratic task of informing the public about what elected representatives are doing.

For me as a Member of the House, this recent set of awards by Wellesley is a "twofer." One of the most important institutions in my district has chosen to honor several of its alumnae, and has included within that group two women who have done a superb job of presenting this institution to the public with all of its strengths, faults, and in between. I ask that the record of this event be printed here.

The material follows:

**WELL-KNOWN ALUMNAE TO BE HONORED AT WELLESLEY COLLEGE**

National Public Radio journalists "Cokie" Roberts and Linda Wertheimer will join Dr. Terri Grodzicker, internationally recognized molecular geneticist, as recipients of Alumnae Achievement Awards to be presented at Wellesley College on February 28. Muriel Gardiner, who died earlier this month at the age of 83 after a distinguished career as a psychoanalyst, will be granted the Award posthumously; she was also widely known for the role she played in helping hundreds escape Nazi persecution in prewar Vienna.

Awards will be made by Helen B. O'Bannon, who was an Alumnae Achievement Award winner in 1980 and is currently president of the Wellesley College Alumnae Association.

Since initiated in 1969, the Awards have honored distinguished and sustained accomplishment in professional or volunteer pursuits. Previous recipients include such notables as television journalist Elizabeth Drew, opera singer Phyllis Curtin, and diplomat Colette Flesch of Luxembourg.

**MURIEL MORRIS GARDINER**

Muriel Gardiner died on February 6, three weeks before she was scheduled to receive an Alumnae Achievement Award from Wellesley College. A distinguished psychoanalyst and author, she was also the woman whom many believe was the inspiration for Julia, the film based on Lillian Hellman's bestseller *Pentimento*.

Muriel Gardiner was born in Chicago in 1901. Unlike many young women of her day and means, she eschewed personal comforts and espoused political causes. At ten, she organized schoolmates into a suffragette parade. As an undergraduate at Wellesley College, she headed the Wellesley Forum, served as first president of the Intercolle-

giate Liberal League, and set up a World War I relief fund. A Durant Scholar, she graduated from Wellesley in 1922 with a major in English, subsequently studying literature at Oxford University.

Growing interest in psychoanalysis attracted her to Vienna where she entered analysis with Sigmund Freud's protegee Ruth Mack Brunswick and became a life-long friend of his daughter, Anna. In later years she supported ongoing efforts to preserve Freud's London home as a museum. Intrigued by psychoanalysis as a career, she enrolled at the University of Vienna Medical School, graduating in 1938.

After witnessing a barbaric raid on Jewish and socialist students, she joined Austria's anti-Fascist underground. As related in *Code Name Mary: Memoirs of an American Woman in the Austrian Underground* (1983), she smuggled false passports into the country, acted as a courier between socialists in Austria and Czechoslovakia, offered her home as a "safe house," and provided funds enabling countless numbers of Jews and dissidents to escape from the Nazis. Gardiner left Vienna in 1938, fleeing to Paris where she married her second husband, Joseph Buttinger, head of the Austrian Revolutionary Socialists and one of the resistance leaders whom she had helped to escape.

Returning to the United States with Buttinger and her daughter, Constance, she became prominent as a psychoanalyst for disturbed children. She also served on the editorial board of the *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis*, as the author of *The Deadly Innocents: Portraits of Children Who Kill* (1976), as editor of *The Wolf-Man* (1971), and as a consultant to schools in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

When Muriel Gardiner, who was a resident of Pennington, New Jersey, is awarded a posthumous Alumnae Achievement Award on February 28, she will be the second member of her family honored by the Wellesley College Alumnae Association. Her sister, Manhattan pediatrician Ruth Bakwin, accepted an Achievement Award in 1983.

**COKIE BOGGS ROBERTS**

Corinne ("Cokie") Roberts is a Congressional news commentator for National Public Radio who specializes in covering Congressional activities and political campaigns. She appears regularly on NPR's "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered."

In addition, Roberts co-hosts "The Lawmakers," a weekly report on Congress produced by WETA-TV in Washington, D.C. She has published articles in the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Commonweal*, *New Leader*, and *The New York Times Magazine*.

Daughter of Representative Lindy Boggs (D-LA) and the late Louisiana Representative Hale Boggs, Cokie Roberts graduated from Wellesley in 1964 with a major in Political Science. She worked for several news organizations prior to joining KNBC-TV in Los Angeles, where she was the producer of "Serendipity," which won the San Francisco State Award for excellence in local programming and was nominated for an Emmy in children's programming.

From 1974 to 1977, Cokie Roberts reported for CBS News from Athens, Greece. She joined National Public Radio as a reporter in 1978.

Ms. Roberts is a past President of the Radio and Television Correspondents Association.

She and her husband Steven, chief Congressional correspondent for the *New York Times*, have two teenage children, Lee and Rebecca.

**TERRI GRODZICKER**

Terri Grodzicker is an internationally recognized molecular geneticist. Her primary interest is the genetics of human adenoviruses, a group of viruses that produce symptoms similar to those of a severe common cold yet have the potential to cause tumors in rodents.

The Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory in New York, with which she has been affiliated since 1973, has been at the forefront of recombinant DNA research for many years and is currently committed to studies investigating how cancer cells arise and what molecular features permit them to multiply. In addition to her research on DNA tumor viruses, Dr. Grodzicker serves as the Laboratory's Acting Assistant Director for Research and Meetings Program Administration.

Dr. Grodzicker graduated from Wellesley College in 1966 with honors both in physiology and zoology. She was a Wellesley College Scholar and a member of Sigma Xi.

Her master's and doctoral degrees were awarded by Columbia University in 1965 and 1969, respectively. She was named a President's Fellow in 1967-68, and a National Institute of Health Postdoctoral Fellow at Harvard's Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics from 1969 to 1971.

Dr. Grodzicker has served as a consultant to the Human Cell Biology Advisory Panel of the National Science Foundation and to the National Cancer Institute Advisory Committee for Microbiology and the American Society for Virology. Her research findings, published in such journals as *The Journal of Virology*, *Cell*, *Genetic Engineering*, and *The Journal of Molecular Biology*, are widely quoted.

**LINDA COZBY WERTHEIMER**

Linda Cozby Wertheimer is a political and legislative reporter for National Public Radio, where she is a regular broadcaster on its popular "All Things Considered" program. Noted for lively and accurate journalism, she has anchored NPR's coverage of Congressional hearings, political conventions, election night returns and other historic events.

Wertheimer's NPR coverage of the Panama Canal Treaty debates represented the first live Senate floor debate coverage ever broadcast. It ran for 37 days with Ms. Wertheimer on air for as many as ten consecutive hours. Her prodigious efforts were rewarded by high praise from such critics as political analyst Frank Mankiewicz and Vice President Walter Mondale. She subsequently received a Special Citation from Dupont/Columbia Journalism Awards for the coverage.

Linda Wertheimer grew up in Carlsbad, New Mexico. After graduating from Wellesley in 1965 with a major in English, she worked as a production assistant for the British Broadcasting Company in London. Returning to the United States, she worked for WCBS radio in New York City, producing consumer affairs programs.

Wertheimer has been with National Public Radio since 1971 and is currently Vice Chairman of the Congressional Radio and Television Correspondents Association.

She is married to Fred Wertheimer, President of Common Cause, the national citizen's lobby.

*Citations to award recipients*

Muriel Morris Gardiner

With ceaseless energy and courage, you have devoted your life to helping the oppressed. As a resistance worker in Austria you sheltered and sustained refugees from Nazi Europe. In your career as a psychiatrist you have studied and supported emotionally disturbed children. Your humanitarian efforts prove that the individual can still have impact.

Terri Grodzicker

Creative and insightful research in molecular genetics and DNA tumor virology has earned you international recognition as a leader in understanding the control of gene expression in both bacterial and eukaryotic systems. Your development of human adenovirus as an expression vector provides a powerful tool for the analysis of tumor proteins and opens the way for widespread application to other studies in human biology.

Cokie Boggs Roberts

Your extensive research and perceptive political commentaries have put you at the top of your profession of radio reporting. Both as a writer and as a television producer you have also achieved a reputation for excellence.

Linda Cozby Wertheimer

As a radio journalist you have been awarded high praise for political reporting, including your historic live coverage of the Panama Canal Treaty debates. Your continuing concern for communicating government activities to the public contributes to the strength of our democracy. ●

## RIGHT-TO-KNOW LAWS

## HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles, in the Los Angeles Times and the Bergen Record, show State and local governments responding to growing problems in the wake of the chemical disaster in Bhopal, India, and other recent accidents involving toxics here at home. These articles recount how many States and localities have reacted to these incidents by passing community right-to-know laws.

I have recently introduced the first Federal community-right-to-know law as part of the Chemical Manufacturing Safety Act of 1985. This national community-right-to-know legislation, H.R. 965, includes both notification requirements designed to fully inform communities about the potential chemical hazards in their midst and mandatory development of emergency response and evacuation plans. The bill would also create a Federal right to sue for victims of chemical disasters.

This legislation should create powerful incentives for industry to resolve some of the worst and most dangerous pollution problems. Citizens of communities surrounding industrial facilities should have the information and

legal rights they need to insist on adequate protection for themselves and their families.

Other components of the legislation include a bill that would amend the hazardous air pollutant section of the Clean Air Act by mandating the listing of the most dangerous and toxic substances now known. Another bill would protect workers exposed to hazardous substances in the factory by ensuring that weak OSHA right-to-know requirements become the floor and not the ceiling for State efforts to safeguard worker health.

Finally, the legislation creates a regional training program for firefighters and police who deal with transportation accidents which cause dangerous chemical spills.

I urge my colleagues to support the Chemical Manufacturing Safety Act.

The articles follow:

[From the Bergen Record, Jan. 28, 1985]

## STATES AND FEDS FUME OVER RIGHT-TO-KNOW LAWS

(By Bob Sanders)

Few people in Bhopal, India, knew that the Union Carbide's chemicals could kill them.

No one would deny that they had a right to know, but that right was taken from most people in New Jersey, when half of the nation's toughest toxic-disclosure law was gutted Jan. 4 by a federal judge in Newark.

And in the next few months, lawyers representing New Jersey and nine other states, the U.S. government, the AFL-CIO, and Ralph Nader's Public Citizen will be in a federal appeals court in Philadelphia, fighting a constitutional battle over scores of similar laws that grant workers and residents the right to know the names of the toxic chemicals to which they could be exposed.

In the past six years, 20 states and dozens of municipalities have passed right-to-know laws, often over stiff opposition from local industry. Yet no one admits that he's against the right to know. It's like being against mother's milk.

The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) estimates that one worker in four is exposed to hazardous chemicals. In 1978 alone, this exposure caused 174,000 occupational illnesses. In the communities surrounding industrial strongholds, cancer rates are breathtaking.

When the first community right-to-know law in the nation was passed in Philadelphia, pushed by an unusual alliance of labor, environmentalists, and community activists, it was met with stiff industry opposition.

Pennsylvania's state law, passed last month, is the nation's toughest next to New Jersey's. It was signed reluctantly by Gov. Richard Thornburgh after it was nearly gutted in state Senate.

Thornburgh would have preferred a version adopted by Delaware. The law there, drafted by a committee headed by a Du Pont Chemical Company lawyer, is being used as a model by industry throughout the country.

These local initiatives were a response to the sluggishness on the part of the federal government to enact a more comprehensive right to know. Labor has been lobbying since 1974 for the Occupational Safety and

Health Administration (OSHA) to pass a regulation for workers.

OSHA finally issued a comprehensive standard Jan. 16, 1981, during the waning days of the Carter administration. Upon taking office, President Reagan's staff withdrew the standard and wrote a weaker one, one that was finally issued Nov. 25, 1983, to go into effect two years later.

The expressed purpose of the standard was to preempt state law, and it set off legal fireworks. It's this OSHA standard that's being challenged in federal district court in Philadelphia.

The standard is a weak one. Because it was promulgated by the Department of Labor, it automatically excludes residents and public employees, who are outside the sphere of OSHA. In addition, the standard is restricted to the manufacturing sector, excluding 60 million workers, or 76 percent of the workers covered by OSHA. The uncovered industries account for more than half of the reported occupational-health problems related to chemical exposure.

Secretaries, for instance, would not have the right to know what chemicals they breathe in each day at the copying machine. Painters, 71 percent of whom suffer from nervous-system disorders due to exposure to solvents, would also be excluded under the OSHA standard.

The standard explicitly requires labeling and the filing of forms on substances that include just 600 chemicals. It leaves manufacturers to decide what additional chemicals are hazardous. The fox is guarding the chicken coup.

NIOSH's Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances lists 57,000 toxic chemicals. Some states, such as New Jersey and Pennsylvania, would require labeling and forms for every workplace substance, hazardous or not.

Perhaps the most complex legal issue, and the one most raised by industry spokesmen, concerns trade secrets. Each local law has trade-secret provisions, but those outlined in the OSHA standard are broad enough to constitute a loophole.

Once claimed under the standard, trade secrets would be very expensive and time-consuming to challenge, and the penalties for unjustified claims are minuscule. Even physicians treating workers would only have access to such information if they signed a confidentiality agreement and put up as much as their own homes as collateral.

Actually, few chemical names would be considered trade secrets. Most chemicals can easily be traced by a competitor from the actual product. The real secret is how something is made—information that would not be revealed under any right-to-know law.

Had the federal standard been issued before the enactment of numerous local laws, it probably would have been welcomed. But the focus of right-to-know advocates has shifted away from the federal government. Instead, the battle on the local level, and they've been successful.

All these local laws have industry reeling and threaten interstate commerce. For business, a uniform standard would be preferable, a weak standard better still.

The legal arguments are complex, but basically, the AFL-CIO and Public Citizens are challenging the U.S. standard on traditional liberal grounds, arguing that it isn't comprehensive enough. The states are invoking the old conservative battle cry, states rights.

A broad corporate coalition in New Jersey, ranging from Exxon to perfume manufac-

turers, challenged the state's law by appealing to the OSHA standard. The resulting decision backed up the federal government's power to exempt manufacturing industries, where the greatest number of industrial accidents occur, but let the law stand in all the other industries. Since the OSHA standard makes no provision for the community right to know, residents will have no information about the most dangerous industries.

As Jim Lanard, a leader of the New Jersey Right to Know Coalition, said, "You can go to the dentist and know the chemical names of what is in his office, but you can walk by Union Carbide and not have a right to know what hazardous chemicals they are using."

Both sides are appealing the decision, and the coalition is planning to introduce new legislation that will surely be challenged again. Whatever the lower courts decide, the cases will probably find their way to a Supreme Court full of President Reagan's appointees.

There, the judicial irony could continue. For how can a conservative judge, with a historic distrust of big government, rule against local governments' right to pass their own laws? This is one case where Reaganites might be trapped by their own rhetoric.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 6, 1985]

#### AFTER BHOPAL—A LID ON CHEMICALS

(By Michael Wines)

WASHINGTON.—Galvanized by the death of more than 2,000 persons after a toxic gas leak at a Union Carbide plant in Bhopal, India, local and national officials in this country are moving to clamp costly new safety and pollution restrictions on U.S. chemical makers and others who use or transport hazardous substances.

And the chemical industry, aware of its political vulnerability in the wake of the Bhopal disaster, is rushing to take a variety of voluntary actions designed to head off what it fears most: a new round of costly and burdensome regulations.

For example, although the nation's big chemical makers raised a flurry of objections several years ago when the federal government first proposed that workers get detailed information on the hazardous substances they contacted on the job, the giant St. Louis-based Monsanto Co. offered last month to give much the same data to anyone who asks for it.

#### HEIGHTENED PUBLIC CONCERNS

"It's fair to say we're doing this in response to heightened public concerns about chemical hazards after the Bhopal incident," said Larry O'Neill, a Monsanto spokesman.

That concern was evident within days of last December's Indian tragedy, when two Ohio cities, Akron and Canton, passed "community right-to-know" ordinances that force firms to disclose the presence of dangerous chemicals on their property. Cleveland's city council will consider a similar ordinance this month. Massachusetts is beginning to enforce a statewide right-to-know law enacted last summer. Other states, including Louisiana and Washington, are considering measures.

At the national level, a bipartisan group of House members led by Rep. James J. Florio (D-N.J.) proposed a sheaf of federal laws Tuesday mandating disclosure by chemical companies, setting limits on hazardous air pollution and requiring development of evacuation plans for neighborhoods in which heavy industries are located.

#### POWERFUL INCENTIVES

"This legislation should create powerful incentives for industry to resolve some of the worst and most dangerous pollution problems," Florio said.

California Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Los Angeles) plans to attach some of the same measures to new clean air legislation.

When the two congressmen proposed additional environmental controls on the chemical industry last year, the industry successfully opposed them as onerous and unnecessary. But the public revulsion and fear following the Bhopal disaster could prove a potent catalyst for new anti-pollution laws.

"I think we're starting to harvest the results of about 30 years of chemical production," said Rep. Bob Wise (D-W.Va.), whose district includes the Union Carbide chemical works that was a model for the Bhopal plant. "All the problems that have built up over that time are coming up to face us. They can't be put off any longer."

Geraldine V. Cox, vice president and technical director of the Chemical Manufacturers Assn., disagrees: "It's so easy to pick on industry. Let's take the politics out of this and look at the facts. We're the safest industry in the United States."

Indeed, by traditional measures—workers accident rates, lost workdays and so forth—the chemical business has an enviable safety record. In 1983, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 5.5 of every 100 chemical workers suffered job-related injuries or illnesses, compared with 10 of every 100 workers in all manufacturing industries.

But critics such as Florio and Waxman contend those statistics ignore a host of health and safety hazards that chemical plants pose to the millions who live or work nearby.

The threat of a Bhopal-style chemical disaster in the American city is merely the most obvious concern. While both the Environmental Protection Agency and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration have some power to enforce chemical-plant safety, the task has fallen largely to chemical makers themselves.

#### JURISDICTIONAL LIMITS

While no domestic chemical industry accident has claimed a large number of deaths in nearly four decades, the industry's own safety surveys sometimes turn up embarrassing oversights, as when a September study of the Union Carbide plant in Wise's congressional district warned of a "real potential" for a Bhopal-style leak of toxic gas there.

Critics say neither EPA nor OSHA is inclined to force industry to toe the safety line. EPA officials, for example, say the laws that give them the power to regulate underground storage tanks that leak toxins into the ground may not cover those tanks that, like the ones in Bhopal, leak deadly gases into the air.

Similarly, OSHA has responsibility for chemical leaks that stay within a factory's boundaries, but once a deadly gas crosses the company fence, it enters the legal province of the EPA.

The Florio legislation would attempt to abolish such jurisdictional stumbling blocks, and would place most of the safety burden on EPA, which has better chemical industry expertise and records than the understaffed OSHA.

The New Jersey Democrat's proposal also would require industries to draw up emergency evacuation and disaster-response plans in cooperation with local fire, police

and health officials. In addition, it would order regional training programs in chemical emergency procedures for fire and safety officials. Although most big chemical makers already have such plans, critics say they are sometimes poorly prepared and are seldom explained to the persons who would be evacuated in a crisis.

Equally rankling to Florio is the EPA's apparent failure to limit the industry's everyday venting of scores of highly toxic gases, from formaldehyde and phosgene (mustard gas) to small doses of methyl isocyanate, which caused the Bhopal deaths.

In 14 years EPA has set pollution limits on only eight hazardous airborne substances, all of them nationwide health threats that cause cancer when breathed over lengthy periods.

According to agency spokesman John R. O'Connor, those guidelines have allowed the EPA to tackle the biggest pollution problems first. But Waxman charges—and O'Connor agrees—that they virtually exclude such gases as methyl isocyanate, which are lethal in small doses and are found only in isolated factory towns, not nationwide.

The Florio proposal would give the EPA a deadline for classifying the unregulated gases as hazardous air pollutants and setting ceilings on their emissions.

#### GETTING HOUSE IN ORDER

Spurred by the Bhopal accident, the chemical industry has been rushing to place its own house in order before Congress or the states intervene. Cox, of the Chemical Manufacturers Assn., said 90% of firms recently surveyed already have begun "intensive" audits of their safety, transportation and pollution-prevention programs.

"I suspect we may discover things that need to be changed," she said. "We'll volunteer to identify those things and to suggest changes."

Some companies say they have already found ways to improve their plants. Monsanto ordered a company-wide review of safety procedures a week after the Indian disaster, and officials at one typical factory—a Texas plant that makes highly explosive acrylonitrile—are moving to reduce surplus chemical stocks to reduce the potential for leaks and major blasts.

William R. Robirds, a top Monsanto official, says the Texas plant has traditionally concentrated on preventing explosions but is now studying new ways to control leaks of such manufacturing byproducts as deadly hydrogen cyanide gas. The plant last week began new training in cleaning up chemical spills.

Such efforts, Cox says, should reassure the public that the chemical industry "hasn't waited for regulations" to force improvements in its operations. "We don't want a dirty environment," she said, "and we don't want an unsafe workplace."

Monsanto's voluntary offering of data on its chemicals, said Monsanto spokesman O'Neill, shows the company is "promoting public disclosure, not . . . finding reasons to withhold information."

But the industry also seems agreed that it wants no new laws to gum up what it regards as a smooth safety and health program. O'Neill says the company believes existing laws and regulations are adequate. Cox says legislative packages such as Florio's could take years to enact, when all that may be needed is some fine-tuning of existing federal rules.

Chemical makers and other business interests have sometimes fought to discourage state and local efforts to monitor the industry through right-to-know laws. Despite that, nationwide support for community right-to-know laws had been building for several years, advocates say. More than 40 cities and a score of states have enacted laws requiring companies to disclose chemical rosters to their workers or the public.

#### ACCUMULATION OF INCIDENTS

"It's been an accumulation of one toxic incident after another" that spurred several Ohio cities to adopt such ordinances even before Bhopal, said Lucy Audette of the Ohio Public Action Campaign.

In Ohio, the state Chamber of Commerce is leading opposition to the ordinances on the grounds that disclosure is too expensive and may endanger companies' trade-secret formulas. In New Jersey, another "right-to-know" state, the chemical industry went to court to overturn a law that required disclosure to both employees and the public.

A U.S. district court ruled last month that the New Jersey law, one of the nation's toughest, was preempted by a weaker federal right-to-know rule enforced by OSHA that applies only to workers. The ruling effectively bars states from issuing tougher worker-disclosure laws of their own, although it does not limit community right-to-know statutes.

The ruling will cause "no diminution of workplace safety," said Hal Bozarth, executive director of the Chemical Industry Council, which battled the Jersey statute. But the state is appealing the decision, and state legislators are working on community right-to-know legislation that would skirt the ruling.

Florio will offer a less complex solution: one proposed national right-to-know law for citizens, and a second law allowing states such as New Jersey to enact worker right-to-know laws that are tougher than the federal standard.

Either prospect is dismaying to industry experts such as Cox, who warns that the result will be "a couple of lawyers at 20 paces. I'm very worried that if we regress to the confrontational type of politics we had in the '70s, both the environment and the public health will suffer because nothing will get done."

But the confrontation may already be under way. Aides to Florio pledge privately that, if their legislative proposals are not passed as a package, it will be tacked piece by piece onto an endless series of anti-pollution laws that Congress will be considering this year and next. And the Chemical Manufacturers Assn. is already meeting with community groups, newspaper editorial boards and reporters to press its view that Bhopal was the exception, not the rule. ●

#### DECLARATION OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES BY THE CONTRAS

**HON. BOB LIVINGSTON**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the President's critics are wrong when they accuse him of using overblown rhetoric with regard to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. On March 3, 1985, a broad range of Nicaraguan op-

position leaders issued a joint declaration of the democratic principles that guide them, thereby bolstering the President's favorable comparison with our own ancestors and others who have justly resisted the tyranny of the state throughout history.

Their declaration, the "Document on National Dialogue of the Nicaraguan Resistance," merits full support from the Congress and the American people, for it speaks as we would speak. It calls for separation of the Sandinista party from the government and the military, a multiparty electoral system, recognition of the rights of minorities, and a national dialog with the Sandinistas under the aegis of the Nicaraguan Bishops Conference.

Mr. Speaker, if this is what the progressive opposition in Nicaragua is fighting for, why can't this Congress support them? I urge my colleagues to read the text of the declaration, which follows.

#### DOCUMENT ON NATIONAL DIALOGUE OF THE NICARAGUAN RESISTANCE

We, Democratic citizens, representatives of all sectors of the Nicaraguan resistance, announce to the Nicaraguan people, to the governments and peoples of the Americas and of the following manifesto:

#### THE PRESENT SITUATION OF NICARAGUA

In recent years, the sandinista front has submerged our people in a crisis without precedent in our national history. At this time, the impact of this crisis is evident in the economic, political, social and moral spheres of the nation. This situation is rooted both in the abandonment of the original program of government and the fundamental statute as well as in the interference of the Soviet bloc in our internal affairs. Both factors, the sole responsibility of the Sandinista front, have brought about a sharp conflict whose protagonists are the governing party on the one hand and the Nicaraguan people on the other.

The Nicaraguan people reject, of course, the imposition of a regime which in essence contradicts the values and aspirations which gave birth to the revolutionary process. They are founded on the recovery of freedom, democracy and social justice so often postponed because of the Somoza regime.

In conclusion, the national crisis we face did not grow out of a confrontation between imperialism and the revolution, as the Sandinista Front pretends, but out of the contradictions which emerge from the clash between democratic expectations of the Nicaraguan people and the imposition of a totalitarian system such as that which is being implanted in our country by the Sandinista front.

This conflict, which has produced a civil war, today threatens to destroy the Nicaraguan nation. And as stated in the recent document of the Nicaraguan Democratic Coordinator, it cannot be resolved through negotiations between the governments of other nations and the Sandinista Front nor through sectarian dialogues.

From that perspective, it is clear that the elections of November 4, 1984, by virtue of having been a farce, contributed nothing toward the resolution of the national crisis. This view has been supported by Inter-American Commission of Human Rights in its report for the period 1983-84, as well as

by the political groups which decided to participate in the "elections", as they stated in the document entitled "Proposals of Minimum Concurrence for the Renewal of the National Dialogue." Issued in January of this year. The solution to the national crisis can only be found through a genuine understanding among all Nicaraguans that might end the civil war and lead to the reconciliation of the Nicaraguan family.

We wish to emphasize that this is not taken merely to search for a quota of power, but rather it seeks only to establish in Nicaragua the rule of law which will permit the people to live in peace and to go about resolving our problems within a new constitutional order.

#### COMMON ASPIRATIONS

We aspire to the democratization of Nicaragua, conscious that democracy is the only means to carry out an authentic revolution and rescue our national identity sovereignty.

We aspire to reconstructing Nicaragua, to promoting its development in accordance with a model which gives priority to the dispossessed sectors.

We aspire to the establishment of a political system which guarantees a real separation of powers, authentic pluralism and a just, efficient mixed economy.

In order to carry out the foregoing, the following is required:

(a) To recognize the primacy of civilian society with respect to the state and to assure through it the dissolution of the totalitarian state-party-army trilogy.

(b) Full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of expression, assembly, religion and education.

(c) A foreign policy which has as objectives the preservation of national sovereignty, peace and harmony with neighboring countries in particular, and effective reactivation of the historical aspirations of Central American unity.

(e) An economic system which provides for the development of the private sector which includes cooperative enterprises, as well as the clear definition of the participation of the state as a subsidiary economic agent and promoter of social development.

(f) Institutionalization of a multi-party electoral system which guarantees free elections, alternation in power and respect for the minority.

(g) Freedom to organize unions.

(h) A modern, productive process of integral agrarian reform.

(i) Administrative decentralization and effective autonomy for municipal government.

(j) Full recovery of the Atlantic Coast integrating it completely in the national life, guaranteeing respect for the culture and traditions of the various ethnic groups of the region and of the rest of the country within a framework of effective municipal autonomy, exercised in the context of the insolubility of the Nicaraguan nationality.

(k) General amnesty and pardon for political crimes and related crimes.

(l) Expulsion from the country of all foreign internationalists, military advisors and troops, including those who may be found using the identity of deceased Nicaraguan citizens and those who may have been improperly naturalized.

The last and definitive summons: After having carried out multiple peace initiatives in the last three years directed toward establishing a constructive dialogue with the Sandinista front that would end the civil

war and lead to the reconciliation of the Nicaraguan family, we recognize that those efforts have been fruitless and because of the designs of the Soviet bloc.

The Sandinista Front, by ignoring and failing to comply with the agreements made in the past, has lost the necessary credibility to reach a good faith understanding. Such is the case of the agreements reached with the XVII consultative meeting of the OAS Council of Ministers, the original program of government, the fundamental statute, the 18 points of concurrence of the forum of national problems, and the promise to carry out a free and honest election, among others.

Therefore, in view of the gravity of the moment, and conscious of our civic responsibilities and of the urgent need to save our people from greater suffering, we accept the call to convene issued by the Nicaraguan Democratic coordinator and we call upon the Sandinista Front to participate in a national dialogue which will end the national crisis. This dialogue should follow these modalities:

**CONVOCATION**

The Nicaraguan Bishops Conference is the entity with the necessary moral authority to organize and coordinate the national dialogue. In this regard, we reiterate the petition made to it by the Democratic Coordinator to convene the national dialogue.

**PARTICIPANTS**

In order that the dialogue be efficient and produce the desired results, it is necessary to structure it in accordance with Nicaraguan reality. There are two political tendencies in Nicaragua: The Totalita Rian one which for the moment has accepted the Sandinista Front as its vanguard, and the democratic one which is divided into armed and civilian organizations. Therefore, the dialogue should be between these two political tendencies so that both can name their respective delegates, as many as the Bishops Conference feels is appropriate.

**OBSERVERS AND GUARANTORS**

We suggest to the Bishops Conference that it request the participation of the Central American Governments in the dialogue as guarantors of the agreements which may be reached, given the fact that the sisters peoples of Central America are, in the final analysis, those which have been most directly affected by the Nicaraguan crisis.

The presence of these governments and guarantors in no way hinders the presence as observers or even as guarantors of the other governments and democratic entities of the American continent.

**MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

We support fully the minimum requirements demanded by the Democratic Coordinator in order to initiate the national dialogue. They are: Suspension of armed activities, with a cease-fire in situ, lifting of the state of emergency, absolute freedom of expression and assembly, general amnesty and pardon for political crimes and related crimes, entry into effect of the right of asylum and habeus corpus, adding the granting of full protection of the physical and moral integrity of those members of the resistance who participate in the dialogue in the event that it should take place in Nicaragua.

The application of these measures should be carried out under the supervision of the guarantor governments.

**TEMPORARY PERMANENCE OF THE EXECUTIVE**

If this dialogue is carried out, we commit ourselves to accept that Mr. Daniel Ortega

continue acting as head of the executive branch until such time as the people pronounce themselves in a plebiscite. During this period, Mr. Ortega should govern in fulfillment of the promises of the Nicaraguan revolutionary government junta contained in the document of July 12, 1979, and directed to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, and in fulfillment of the original program of government the fundamental statute and the American Human Rights Convention and the Pact of San Jose.

**INITIAL POINTS OF THE AGENDA**

Although it will be up to the Bishops Conference to establish a definitive agenda, by agreement of the parties, we urge it to include as of now the following points:

- (1) That the legal procedure and actions of the government conform immediately to the American Convention of Human Rights, or the Pact of San Jose, which was ratified by the Nicaraguan Government of National Reconstruction on September 25, 1979, declaring it the law of the land and committing the national honor to its enforcement.
- (2) The dismantlement and immediate dissolution of all the repressive party organizations such as the CDS (Sandinista Defense Committees) and the other para-military organs.
- (3) Reduction of military strength, the apolitical nature of the army, an end to the arms race, and the withdrawal of all foreign military troops and advisors and internationalists.
- (4) Immediate dissolution of the National Constituent Assembly.
- (5) A new provisional electoral law.
- (6) A new provisional law for political parties.
- (7) Restructuring of the electoral system in accordance with the above provisional laws.
- (8) Calling of elections for a National Constituent Assembly.
- (9) Calling of municipal elections.
- (10) Calling of a plebiscite on the conduct of new Presidential elections.

**INITIATION OF THE NATIONAL DIALOGUE, INSTRUMENTATION AND DEADLINES**

In order to carry out the national dialogue proposed by the democratic coordinator, on the basis of the statements contained in this document, and conscious of the Leninist tactic of stalling in order to consolidate the totalitarian program of the Frente Sandinista, said dialogue must begin by March 20, 1985. This date cannot be postponed. If by April 20, 1985, the national dialogue has not begun or has not progressed in clear and substantial form, it will be definitely suspended by the Nicaraguan resistance, thereby terminating the possibilities for a peaceful resolution of the national crisis.

If the Nicaraguan Bishops Conference considers it useful to hold conversations with this group for purposes of preparations leading to the speedy realization of the dialogue, we announce our immediate availability to participate in such conversations. To that end we appoint as our representatives Messrs. Arturo J. Cruz, Alfonso Robelo and Adolfo Calero.

May love for our fatherland overcome selfishness and foreign involvement, so that the national directorate of the Sandinista Front will respond positively to this our last effort to grant to our country a civilized solution.

God save Nicaragua. ●

ROBERT W. WOODRUFF: BUSINESSMAN AND PHILANTHROPIST

**HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay public tribute to a man whose deeds are known and cherished in Georgia and throughout the South, Mr. Robert W. Woodruff—an astute businessman, great philanthropist and loyal citizen who passed away early last week. Proclaimed as “a legend of American Business” by the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Woodruff presided at the helm of the Coca-Cola Co. for 6 decades and headed the managerial team that made Coke one of the most recognized trademarks in the world.

His sound foresight and masterful marketing vaulted Coca-Cola from a locally enjoyed Atlanta refreshment to the largest selling soft-drink in the world. Mr. Woodruff promised during World War II that every serviceman and servicewoman would be able to take “the pause that refreshes” for only a nickel, wherever they might be stationed. Not one to go back on his word, he made sure that Coke bottling plants followed U.S. troops all over the world. Since then, Coca-Cola—a proud symbol of American hard work and ingenuity—has been quenching thirsts world wide.

Over his lifetime, Mr. Woodruff amassed a personal fortune estimated at over \$250 million and it would have been easy and not uncommon for a man of this great wealth to simply sit back and reap the benefits that wealth can provide. Instead, Robert Woodruff became a giver, generously donating huge personal savings to improve medical, educational, and cultural facilities in Atlanta.

For many years this great philanthropist went unrecognized by his beneficiaries. He shunned publicity and refused to make his deeds known to the public. As with all truly compassionate men, this anonymous donor's greatest pride came from doing something for somebody without being asked to do it.

It wasn't until 10 years ago that his deeds received the public plaudits they deserve and, in 1980, he transferred \$105 million of the Emily and Ernest Woodruff Foundation, a fund formed at his parent's death to help the South's education and medical need's to Emory University. This is the largest single gift ever made to an educational institution.

This one example cannot come close to describing the true spirit of philanthropy embodied by Robert W. Woodruff. His deeds will be memorialized

through the many buildings and facilities named after him in Georgia, but more importantly, he will be remembered in the hearts and souls of the lives he touched. ●

THE PRESIDENT KEEPS HIS PROMISES

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has kept his solemn promises to the American people. Early on in his administration, he pledged to work for peace in the world through arms reductions and dialog with the Soviet Union. He has kept these promises.

I recently returned from the newly initiated arms talks in Geneva. I am convinced, more than ever, that the administration is deeply committed to progress in the arms negotiations.

The record will show that the President has a long record of thoughtful reflection about arms control, and realizes the futility of nuclear war. Just last week, new arms reduction talks began in Geneva. The President has given these hand-picked professionals much latitude for serious give and take in the talks. Few could argue with their credentials. They are men who have clearly distinguished themselves in service to our Nation, both in the executive and in the legislative branches of Government. I strongly support the ongoing arms control talks and wish them well in meeting the challenging tasks before them.

Our relations with the Soviet Union are also now improving. Our two nations have recently signed agreements to upgrade hot-line crisis communications. Other agreements include cultural exchanges, fishing rights, and grain sales.

In addition, the President has held out the olive branch to the new Soviet leader, Mr. Gorbachev. Let us hope that the Soviets will accept our Government's offer to hold a summit meeting in the near future. Mr. Gorbachev has a tenure that could last through the end of the century. This provides a classic opportunity to expect success, not failure, out of immediate and future East-West contacts.

With these thoughts in mind, I recommend the following Christian Science Monitor editorial, concerning the President's commitment to peace and arms reductions, to my colleagues in the Congress.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 13, 1985]

SERIOUS ABOUT ARMS

(By John Hughes)

As the Geneva talks open, three little vignettes tell a great deal about Ronald Reagan's approach to arms control.

Vignette No. 1: On a balmy day last summer, when he was on vacation in California, President Reagan sat down with Secretary of State George P. Shultz to go over his foreign policy agenda.

Mr. Shultz mentioned that in the fall, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko was expected to make an appearance at the United Nations General Assembly. In the past, the Soviet foreign minister had also met with the incumbent president of the United States, but those visits were halted by President Carter when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan.

Instantly, President Reagan seized upon the opportunity. He instructed Shultz to pursue the possibility of getting Mr. Gromyko to come to Washington to discuss US-Soviet relations in general and arms control in particular.

The project was closely held among Reagan, Shultz, and national-security adviser Robert C. McFarlane. Working quietly through the Soviet embassy in Washington, Shultz brought it to fruition. Gromyko did come to Washington and meet with the President, leading to the resumption of arms reduction talks in Geneva this week.

Some reporters speculated that it was all a public relations extravaganza orchestrated by Michael Deaver, who was the President's image-burnisher. They were wrong. Neither Mr. Deaver, James Baker, nor other White House aides were in on the plan until the meeting was firmly set. It was the President's idea. The President took the lead.

Vignette No. 2: A couple of years ago, Shultz was delivering a commencement address at Stanford University. He offered his audience a quotation: "A nuclear war must never be fought, and can never be won." The audience roared its approval. Then Shultz startled his listeners by adding: "You know who said that? Ronald Reagan." It was a viewpoint Reagan had advanced on a number of occasions but which had never been headlined. Its most dramatic expression came later, in November 1983, when Reagan visited Japan, victim of a nuclear holocaust, and repeated it in an address to the Diet. Though it got headlines then, it had been a longstanding Reagan conviction.

Vignette No. 3: When Ronald Reagan was preparing a major speech for March 1983, the advance draft circulated among key administration officials had a notation: "Insert to come later." When Reagan delivered the speech he stunned many, including officials in his own administration, by proposing his Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed "star wars." It was a concept he had been thinking about at least since 1967, when as governor of California he visited the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the home of much research for such far-out technology.

These three vignettes, taken together, indicate that Ronald Reagan has a long record of thoughtful reflection about arms control.

How does this fit with a President pushing the MX missile and a larger defense budget? It fits, because he believes you head into arms reduction negotiations from a position of strength.

Star wars is close to Ronald Reagan's heart because it is a defensive, rather than

March 19, 1985

an offensive, concept. He finds that more moral than our present strategy of mutual assured destruction (MAD), which guarantees that if they blow us up, we blow them up.

He has told close advisers of his dream of a world free of nuclear weapons. Some do not take this seriously. Some think it is dangerous because without a Western nuclear deterrent, the Soviets might be tempted to use their superiority in conventional weaponry.

The fact is, Mr. Reagan has been pondering the problem of nuclear arms reduction for some time. Those who do not take him seriously on this subject may be making a serious misjudgment. ●

SILVIO CONTE HONORED AGAIN FOR HIS WORK TO SUPPORT OUR NATION'S HEALTH CARE RESEARCH

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague SILVIO CONTE has been honored again for his ongoing efforts to provide vital Federal support for our Nation's medical research programs.

The National Institutes of Health's new digestive research centers have been designated the Conte Centers in recognition of his untiring work in this area as the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Health. I have the distinct honor of serving with SIL on the subcommittee and know first hand of his concern and support for improving health care in all areas.

SIL was bestowed this most recent honor last month in Baltimore during a legislative seminar for the coalition of Digestive Disease Organizations, a national organization of 30 lay and professional associations concerned with diseases of the digestive system.

Following my remarks, I would like to include SIL's speech to the organization which summarizes his commitment over the years to improving the health and well being of the American people. The latest honor SIL has received comes from health care professionals who fully understand the great contribution he has made to the field of medical science.

REMARKS OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE (R-MASS.) AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SEMINAR OF THE COALITION OF DIGESTIVE DISEASE ORGANIZATIONS, BALTIMORE, FEBRUARY 15, 1985

Thank you very much. I am deeply honored by the Coalition's action to designate the new digestive disease research centers at the National Institutes of Health as the Conte centers.

I am not sure the 6 centers that received their grants last fall knew what they were in for. I am sure that provisions relating to what they would call themselves were not in

their contracts. But I am pleased to say that I have received letters from the principal investigators at all 6 centers, and they all seem agreeable, at least in principle, to the idea. Let me, at this point, announce that the official colors will be green and blue, the working hours are 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., and 2 weeks vacation per year will be allowed. Any center carrying the Conte name has a reputation of hard work to maintain.

Names like these do have a way of catching on. There are many examples of the names of Congressional sponsors being attached to their legislative efforts. There is, for instance, the Monroe Doctrine, promulgated to stop the transportation of men-of-war across state lines for purposes of intrigue, or even the Mann Act, relating to the transportation of ladies of peace across state lines for intriguing purposes. However, for purposes of posterity, I would be happy to forego some of that type of notoriety.

But seriously, let me say that, for me, this is surely a once in a lifetime event. I want you to know, from the bottom of my heart, that I deeply appreciate the honor you have given me by so naming the digestive disease centers of excellence.

Let me also say that it is a great pleasure for me to be with the Coalition again. Our efforts, and our work together, go back a good many years.

I remember back in December of 1977, at the national affairs conference of the—I'm going to use the initials, and I hope everyone knows what they stand for, or else someone else will have to pronounce it—A.G.A. (American Gastroenterological Association), when I got together with many of you for the first time. Dr. John Sessions ran that conference. My wife Corinne and I were there. I remember John Grupenhof had just married, bringing his 7 children and his wife's one child together. I think I offered a toast wishing the new couple that all their troubles would be little ones. We can now get a report on whether that turned out to be the case.

And then in May of 1983, I had the opportunity to speak to the Coalition, at a time when the feasibility of establishing centers was still being discussed. Somehow, the enthusiasm of the Membership and of your President, Suzanne Rosenthal, was infectious.

Well, here we are a few years later, and many of the goals that the Coalition set forth have either been reached or are well on their way to being reached. You have shown that, together with your excellent representation in Washington, you can make a convincing case to the Congress and so have proved your effectiveness as a Coalition.

At a time when there has been so little that is new and exciting in the federal budget, I am proud to have had a hand in this important initiative, which could lead to tremendous benefits to thousands of people in the future.

In addition, let me say that the cooperation of the National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes Digestive, and Kidney Diseases has been great. I have a feeling that if the Institute had not been in favor of the idea, this initiative would not be nearly as far along as it is.

Of course, nothing ever goes completely without a hitch. One of the hitches in the digestive disease center program involves the directive that the Young Slasher has issued to NIH, reducing the number of new grants NIH can make from 6500 to 5000 and holding the number of centers at the level

of 500, instead of the 533 that we had provided funding for.

The second round of new digestive disease centers, that we worked to include funding for in the appropriation bill, is obviously smack in the middle of those 33 new centers that the young slasher has ordered to be funded. And so, instead of the total number of as many as 10 centers that we had all been planning on by this coming September, we can now only be certain of the continuation of the 6 that were awarded last September and possibly one additional center that the Institute has indicated it might be able to squeeze through.

Since this is my first opportunity to comment publicly on National Institutes of Health issues since the budget came out on February 4, I would like to take a moment to address the pending dispute over how NIH is to spend the record \$5.15 billion that we appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The action by OMB to limit the number of new and competing grants and centers came as a complete surprise to just about everyone, as far as I can tell. As late as the end of last year, all signals pointed to a freeze in NIH, with the exception of a small percentage reduction for management initiatives.

But the reason for the OMB action is clear. It relates to a problem we could see coming in the 1986 and 1987 budgets. The problem is this. To increase new and competing grants to 6500 costs something like an additional \$200 million. But since the average NIH grant runs 3 years, it is not enough to increase the budget in one year and then freeze. To sustain a permanent increase to 6500 new grants, you have to provide the required \$200 million increase not one, not two, but more like every year for three years.

When you put that together with inflationary costs, the rise in the average size of all grants, competing and continuation, and with other demands on NIH, it is clear that sustaining 6500 new and competing grants would require substantial increases in 1986 and 1987 in the NIH budget, along the lines of the increase we provided in this year's appropriation.

So OMB took one look at what was coming down the road, and hatched this plan to avoid the impending increases by limiting the growth in the number of new and competing grants before that growth got started.

It is an ingenious plan. First, it takes the number of new and competing grants and centers we thought we funded in FY 1985 and reduces them from 6526 to 5000 and 533 to 500 respectively, so that represents substantial savings. Second, the 5,000 level represents a reduction from the actual number we funded in 1984 of 5493, so there is a savings there. And third, by providing two and three years worth of funding to a number of grants and centers, instead of the usual one year at a time, in order to use up the additional funds that Congress appropriated, the plan removes these continuation costs from the funding base in 1986 and 1987, and so represents a substantial savings there as well.

The bottom line is that instead of facing the likelihood of substantial increases in 1986 and 1987, the OMB plan calls for a reduction, as a result of all these savings, from \$5.15 billion in 1985 to \$4.85 billion in 1986, \$300 million less.

The question then becomes what is Congress' reaction going to be to this proposal. In my view, there are two distinct issues

that are, and hopefully will be kept, separate.

The first is the balance of power issue. Can OMB and the Executive Branch come in, simply ignore the clear intent of Congress, and impose its unfettered will on NIH in a way clever enough to avoid charges of illegal impoundment of funds? I hope it does not come to that. And there are signs that it might not.

Last week, Dave Stockman, the New Treasury Secretary Jim Baker, and the lone Economic Advisor, William Niskanen appeared before the full Appropriations Committee for an overview of the President's budget proposal. At that time, my good friend, Bill Natcher, the Chairman of the Labor, HHS Subcommittee asked Stockman about the NIH proposal.

After buttering up Stockman with thanks for helping get our Labor, HHS bill signed by the President two years in a row, after 5 years of continuing resolutions, Bill asked Stockman if he intended to seek the Committee's approval of the NIH changes prior to their taking effect. And Stockman came back with what sounded like a conciliatory reply.

He said, and I quote from the uncorrected transcript, "Mr. Chairman, let me answer by saying we would like to discuss it with you and hope to persuade you of the merits and recognizing that if you are not persuaded by our case, that you have ways of instructing us to do otherwise." End quote. It is my hope that this represents a willingness to work with the Committee and to abide by the decisions that the Committee will make on the proposed changes in the FY 1985 NIH budget.

The second issue relates to whether it makes sense to take a second look at the fiscal year 1985 NIH budget that we passed, especially now that it is clear that in fiscal year 1986, all parts of the federal budget are likely to be substantially restrained, in order to make inroads on the projected \$220 billion deficit.

After all, if you go back and look at the record, the House approved 6200 new and competing grants. What's more, when we had the Nobel Laureate Scientists before us last year, and the Coalition of Health Groups, and just about every other outside group, all of them asked for 6200.

But out of the blue, the Senate did some grandstanding, and came out with a bill proposing 6800 new and competing grants. When the House and Senate conferred, we compromised at 6526 new and competing grants. But it may be that we bit off more than we could chew. I'm not saying that we're in all of this trouble because of the Senate—far be it from me to suggest that—but it is clear that if we want to stay with 6500 in 1985 and sustain 6500 in 1986, we may have to add something like \$700 million to the President's budget proposal, which is not going to be easy by any stretch of the imagination.

So we will have to consider the NIH issues carefully and deliberately. Let me say two things, though. First, there is one action that could undermine the Committees ability to examine the issues. If NIH goes ahead and funds any grants or centers for two or three years, prior to Congress having an opportunity to look into this, then our ability to pass on the 1985 OMB proposals will be undermined. So let me say openly and publicly that neither OMB, nor HHS, nor NIH should start multi-year funding while these issues are pending. In my view, that would

provoke the institutional confrontation that I believe should be avoided.

Let me also say that I will do what I can to see that the second round of digestive disease centers goes forward in 1985, and that we stay as close as we can to the original schedule of having the full set of centers up and operating by the end of this fiscal year.

Now, for one who professes the maxim that a good speech has a beginning and an ending without too much space in between, I have already gone on for quite a while.

Before letting everybody get back to the festivities, I wanted to take a moment just to underline the seriousness of the fiscal situation with which the Congress is faced this year. It is clear that without very strong and affirmative action by the Congress, the deficit will continue to grow. Domestic restraint, no new taxes, and defense increases, there is now no question, cannot be put forward with any kind of a straight face, as the stuff of which balanced budgets are made. As the Young Slasher puts it, this is a year for house cleaning rather than housekeeping, and there is little or no room for growth in 1986, for any program. On the domestic side, a freeze has probably got to be everybody's starting point, and it will take some luck to end up there.

On the other hand, it is not the time to roll over and play dead, to let destiny take its course. Yesterday's papers carried as their headlines the results of the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness, which documented the serious erosion of U.S. industrial strength. If there is one bright light in this nation's research and development efforts, which has led not only to unprecedented advances, but also industrial offshoots that are the envy of the world, it is our biomedical research community.

You don't have to be someone who is afflicted with an illness or an academic researcher looking for funding to see the benefits of our biomedical research enterprise. In fact if there is anybody who ought to be singing the praises of the NIH efforts, it is the very people who are trying to put the economy of the United States on a firm ground. I am growing exasperated with the shortsightedness that has been coming out of the science policy advisers. They wouldn't know a good thing if it hit them in the face. But I do know one thing. If the Japanese are watching what is being proposed for the one area of high technology where we have successfully outpaced them, they must be having a good laugh.

So we must do what we can to support a justifiable priority of the federal government's efforts. It just isn't going to be easy, that's all there is to it.

Well, I have gone a long ways off the occasion that brings us together tonight. You have been very accommodating in bearing with me. I want to thank you for the very great honor you have done me this evening. This is an evening I will always remember.

And if I'm in luck, this will also help get me known almost as widely as the Coalition's own representative, Harley Dirks, who is already world famous for the book that's been written about him.

Thank you very much.●

## WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

### HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1985

● Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, Georgia has been a part of these United States since its inception, and the history of our State is filled with the deeds and courage of many Americans. When Georgia students are taught history, they are also told of the contributions to this Nation and to our progress that were made by Georgians.

Unfortunately, in this recital of Georgia's history, the advances made by many of the women of our State are not mentioned, and it is some of these I want to tell you about today.

Most people are aware that James Oglethorpe first discovered and explored the State that is now Georgia, but he wasn't able to travel among the natives alone. Instead, he explored the area with the help of Mary Musgrove and her husband. These native Indians acted as interpreters and guides for Oglethorpe, and it is with a great deal of justification that Mary Musgrove is sometimes called the Pocohontas of Georgia.

The founding leader of the women's movement in Georgia came from one of the cities in my district. H. Augusta Howard, a Columbus, GA resident, founded the Georgia Woman Suffrage Association in Columbus in 1890. Her association's purpose was to win the right of women to vote in America and many say that the women's movement in Georgia can be traced to Ms. Howard and her efforts.

One of America's most famous aviators was a Georgian and also spent a portion of her life in Columbus. Jacqueline Cochran spent her childhood working in the mills of Columbus and later, took a position with a local beauty shop. Ms. Cochran earned fame later in her life when, after taking flying lessons, she became an aviator. During World War II, she was the leader of the WASP's [Women's Air Service Pilots] and their daring exploits in helping the United States win the war have become well known. Ms. Cochran also set quite a few aviation records, including several for speed, and proved to the world that women are as capable in the cockpit as any man.

I have told you about these women, Mr. Speaker, just to point out that women contributing significantly to our society is not just a product of the movement of the last few decades. They have always been a part of America's history—we just haven't recognized their contribution as we should.

These women I have told you about led the way for many other women in our Nation and in my State. Their

legacy has been passed on to the current generation and, from what I have seen, the women of today are doing an exemplary job of continuing to make American history.

Mary Musgrove helped a traveler move through new territory—women today are explorers in their own right, breaking new ground in medicine, science, and even space. H. Augusta Howard wanted women to have the right to vote—today women are more politically active than ever and some of our Nation's finest leaders are women. Jacqueline Cochran led the way for women to hold positions previously reserved just for men—today we have successful women in almost all fields, including traditionally male fields such as law, business, and even construction.

This country was not built by men alone, and its future will not be determined by just one sex. We are making significant progress in this country toward achieving the goal of equality for all, and in this women's history week, I want to urge the Congress to continue to address issues that will bring the women of America to the equal status to which they are entitled.●

## A SALUTE TO CORA COCKS

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 27th of this month, one of my district's most beloved and respected residents, Cora Cocks, will celebrate her 82d birthday. I take this opportunity to bring Cora's outstanding record of public achievement to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation.

Born in Butte, MT, Cora graduated—with honors—from Montana State University at Missoula in 1924. Upon graduation, she married Russell Cocks and later moved to Seattle, WA, where their two sons, Jack and Jerry, were born.

In 1929, the Cocks family opted for southern California and settled in Long Beach. It was here where Cora's community voluntarism began and where she would later say in a 1983 interview, "Any board in town—you name it and I've been on it."

It would be impossible for me to mention all of Cora's accomplishments over the past 5½ decades in this tribute. I would, however, like to highlight a few of the posts she has held. They are as follows:

Senior Care Action Network [SCAN], president; Community Welfare Council, president; California Commission on Aging, chairwoman; California Silver-Haired Legislature, delegate; State House Conference on

Aging, delegate; White House Conference on Aging; Poverty Commission of Community Services Development Corporation; Council of Seniors of Greater Long Beach Area, president; St. Mary Medical Center Housing Commission; United Way Board; Long Beach Advisory Commission on Aging; and, Long Beach Food Bank.

Mr. Speaker, Cora Cocks is one of those very special people which make this world a better place to live. Her community spirit, compassion and dedication is an example for us all. The city of Long Beach has indeed been fortunate to count Cora as one of their neighborhood activists.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating and thanking Cora Cocks on all her fine work over the years. We wish her continued success and prosperity in the years ahead.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE  
LADY COLONELS

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the girls' basketball team for Whitley County High School in Williamsburg, KY, won the Kentucky State championship.

Led by Coach Jim Rains, the Lady Colonels beat two Louisville teams, Atherton and Southern, to take the girls' State title. With sheer determination, the team had taken on all comers and had come out victorious.

For the town of Williamsburg and for all of Whitley County, this victory is symbolic of the strength of the people of Whitley County and their own determination. The enormous welcome which they held for the team upon its arrival back home is simply an expression of the pride and love they feel for these girls and what they have accomplished.

Whitley Countians already have much to be proud of. Their heritage, their contributions to our economy, and their patriotism are unequaled anywhere. Now, this victory by the Lady Colonels is another accomplishment which can be added to that list.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me today in saluting the Lady Colonels of Whitley County High School, and congratulating them on a job well done. All of us in the Fifth District of Kentucky share the joy which these fine young women have brought to their community and their school.●

ANDREW WOLFE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial written by a good friend of mine, and one of the most respected journalists in my congressional district—Andy Wolfe. In this editorial, he asks some important questions about the State of American journalism. I will not attempt to summarize it—the editorial speaks eloquently for itself.

THE DECLINE OF A FREE PRESS—WHITHER HONESTY?

We were never a great admirer of General Westmoreland.

We don't think he did a very good job of generalship in Vietnam, and some of his public statements and reports we recall as being vainglorious and stupid.

And we're inclined to think that CBS, which produced the disputed TV program on Westmoreland's troop strength reports, probably steered just inches short of libeling the general.

So, if the general's lawsuit is called off, we suppose that CBS has proved it didn't libel the general.

However, more important than the general's lawsuit is the fact that many television "news" techniques now are being exposed as misleading to the point of dishonesty.

The whole process of film and sound editing is being called in question.

When film sequences and sound are rearranged to add to the drama of a news report, the producers often are being dishonest.

If an individual makes a coordinated statement on some subject, and a much-edited version of the statement is run, the editing can be used to greatly distort the original statement.

If the impression is given that the edited statement has not been edited, the violation of journalistic ethics is much greater.

Worse is the technique of chopping up such statements and later allowing opponents to make rejoinders which effectively destroy the credibility of the original statement.

This process is commonplace and even is being used by TV broadcasters in this metropolitan area.

It was used in the Westmoreland TV program and clearly must be stopped. Perhaps such material should carry the caption: "Edited, shortened, and rearranged."

Another highly questionable practice is the so called "TV docudrama" which intersperses factual and fictional material. This recently came to national attention in the affair of the program on the Atlanta child murders. Aside from the question of whether that program served any justifiable purpose, it clearly ruptured the basic code of journalistic conduct.

That some of the fictional material could be construed as supporting the program's questionable theme of justice denied was a further and most flagrant violation.

What can be done about all this?

We don't think legislation is the answer, for the First Amendment's protection of a free press cannot be compromised.

But we do think the commercial and other motivations of news media must be exam-

ined. The way journalism now is organized in immensely competitive monopolies, the prizes go to the barracuda reporters, editors, and producers.

A doctrinaire adherence to some specialized brand of politics frequently is seen as excusing all sins, including lack of elemental decency.

Obviously, ratings, and circulation have become central factors in the handling of news.

Many major news organizations picture themselves daily as valiant defenders of a free press while in virtually every edition and every broadcast they violate journalistic ideals.

Pulitzer Prizes, theoretically designed to improve journalistic standards, have become commercial goals beyond price. Newspapers have set up departments to work year-round on preparation of entries. The level to which the Pulitzer mania has descended was never better illustrated than in the phony story which won a prize, which then had to be returned.

The Washington Post reporter responsible was fired. But what of the Post management and the distorted values which made the fraud possible?

What of news managements which use distorted news to discredit competitors?

Yes, this is a time of crisis for American journalism—a time in which the basic honesty of the press is not only questioned, but often completely discounted.

Who is doing anything about this?

Practically no one.

Years ago the late A.J. Liebling wrote an extraordinary series of articles for The New Yorker magazine called "The Wayward Press." He was perhaps the most sensitive and intelligent commentator on the press that we have had, but we have not seen his like since.

Occasionally, journalism professors and other critics will voice sharp opinions of the print and broadcast press, but their strictures never get public attention.

Always onward move the giant monopolies which profess adherence to journalistic canons, but have no honesty and no charity.

Time magazine in the Sharon case and CBS in the Westmoreland case may have escaped libel awards, but within living memory the public view of the press never has been lower.

The press violently resents and repels criticism from the outside. But we doubt that it now can save itself.

It has become a national problem which demands a national answer.●

THE MX: THE VITAL BRIDGE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the next week or so we will be deluged by arguments for and against the MX missile. Before the deluge begins, I'd like to call to the attention of our colleagues an excellent article supporting the MX. It is written by Nicholas F. Brady, former Senator from New Jersey and a member of the Scowcroft Commission, which proposed the deployment of 100 MX missiles in silos,

coupled with arms-control negotiations and the development of a small, single-warhead missile. I commend this article to your attention because it answers many of the questions raised against the MX.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD, "The Vital Bridge", by Nicholas F. Brady, in the Wall Street Journal, Monday, March 18, 1985.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 1985]

"THE VITAL BRIDGE"

(By Nicholas F. Brady)

It has been two years and several million words since the bipartisan President's Commission on Strategic Forces—known as the Scowcroft Commission—submitted its recommendations. Once again, the MX missile's fate hangs in the balance before Congress.

The commission's proposal, endorsed by the president, was for the deployment of 100 MX missiles in silos, coupled with arms-control negotiations and the development of a small, single-warhead missile. It has been the source of two years of congressional debate. As Congress approaches yet another crucial vote on the release of 1985 MX funds held hostage since last June, something of grave importance remains at stake here of even greater value than the MX alone, but of which the MX is an intrinsic and inextricable part.

Two years ago, President Reagan and Congress struck a bargain based on the program prescribed by the Scowcroft Commission. Two parts of the program have been fulfilled, the two parts Congress deemed essential for its approval of the MX. Arms-control negotiations with the Soviet Union have resumed, and work on the Midgetman missile is under way. So, in the fickle world of politics, it comes as no surprise that foes of the MX now proclaim these developments negate our need for the MX. Their arguments are as inadequate as they are predictable.

President Reagan is not just playing political hardball when he argues that killing the MX, either outright or under the guise of delayed and stretched-out production, can and will do tremendous harm to the prospects for serious negotiations and meaningful arms-limitation results. It shouldn't take a brilliant negotiator to recognize that unilaterally doing away with our most modern and capable intercontinental ballistic missile as we sit down at the bargaining table will not encourage the Soviets to come forward with the hard concessions required for a viable arms-control treaty.

Even two years ago, the Scowcroft Commission saw the MX program as far more than an essential "bargaining chip." We saw it as a demonstration of national will, not blind willfulness, and the tough commitment required for solving the complex problems of strategic-force modernization. That expression of national will has become tattered during the repeated MX debates of the past two years, but it is still essential and must be sustained.

Timely though these arms-control arguments are, we must not forget there are sound military reasons for deploying the MX. To review the basic facts, the U.S. hasn't deployed a new ICBM in more than a decade, since the three-warhead Minuteman III was fielded at the beginning of the MIRVed ICBM era. Meanwhile, the Soviets, profiting from advances in missile technolo-

gy, have deployed more than 600 SS-18s and SS-19s. Both missiles carry multiple warheads, the SS-18 ten and the SS-19 six, and both possess the accuracy to destroy the U.S. ICBM silos and other hardened targets. Furthermore, the Soviets are currently flight testing two new ICBMs with capabilities comparable with the MX and Midgetman.

The Scowcroft Commission determined that despite the development of other new systems, such as the D-5 missile for the Trident submarine, the U.S. needs to counter the Soviet ICBM buildup with modernization of our ICBM force. ICBMs still hold advantages in command and control, ready re-targeting, and accuracy, which means they are most effective in putting at risk those hardened military and political targets the Soviets care most about. And the MX is the only ICBM capable of countering Soviet advances that the U.S. can deploy before the early 1990s.

The most cost-effective means of basing the MX is in silos. Their imperfect vulnerability is cause for concern only if one gives credence to the unrealistic scenario of an attack on our ICBM force alone, an attack that would leave our submarine and bomber forces intact for massive retaliation. Thus, as the Scowcroft Commission stated, "the different components of our strategic forces should be assessed collectively and not in isolation."

Those who have opposed the MX because it lacks a survivable basing mode now couple this criticism with a rationale that argues that because the Midgetman is underway, the MX has become an outdated step in our strategic-force modernization that we can now afford to skip altogether. This is dangerously untrue. Those who speak of the Midgetman as if it is already a strategic reality make a dangerous miscalculation. The Midgetman concept is an excellent idea—representing a crucial step in increasing nuclear stability by virtue of its superior survivability. An excellent idea—if it works.

But will it work and will it be allowed to work? The honest answer is we don't know yet. As far as it has progressed, the small missile looks promising; the Air Force is managing to meet the 30,000-pound weight limit set by Congress. However, it will be two years before we know whether a mobile launcher hardened to withstand blast pressure of 35 pounds per square inch, the level required to make it survivable, can be built. The alternative to a mobile launcher, super-hardened silos, also requires another two years of research.

And these are not the only hurdles the Midgetman must cross. All too predictably, the political attacks on the small missile have already begun. Some see its accuracy as destabilizing, some would put multiple warheads on it and some oppose it as a threat to the MX program. Nobody who knows Congress can be surprised by this sniping. And anyone who thinks it will diminish as Congress approaches decisions on the hard realities of the Midgetman's high cost and the 10,000 square miles of land required for mobile basing is extremely naive.

IN CONGRESS'S HANDS

So the MX remains the vital bridge between the present and our still uncertain future strategic-force structure. And the Soviets know it. Furthermore, even before "Star Wars" raised the possibility of widespread deployment of strategic defenses, the Scowcroft Commission recognized that the small missile would not have the throw weight necessary to carry the penetration

aids and decoys required to counter a Soviet abandonment of the ABM Treaty. The MX does. In addition, the MX has the multiple warheads needed to penetrate potential Soviet defenses, thus sustaining the fundamental role of our strategic forces: the retaliatory capability sufficient to deter a Soviet attack.

The future of the MX, and of our nation's defense, is in the hands of Congress. President Reagan has kept his part of the bargain: Arms-control talks and development of a small missile are under way. It's now Congress's turn. ●

AMERICAN SAMOANS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation to benefit American Samoans, both in American Samoa and in the United States. These two bills are identical to legislation introduced in the Senate by my esteemed colleague from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE].

The first bill would authorize the Native American Programs Office in the Department of Health and Human Services to make grants to American Samoan organizations from the same fund from which it makes grants to other native American organizations. The second bill would allow American Samoan organizations to receive grants from the native American component of the Job Training Partnership Act. Neither bill authorizes any new funding so they will not adversely affect our efforts to curb the Federal deficit. They simply allow American Samoans to access existing grant programs.

I am introducing this legislation in response to a report on unemployment and training needs of American Samoans commissioned by the Department of Labor. This report concluded that the unemployment rate of American Samoan males as of the 1980 census was 80 percent higher than that of American males as a whole. In addition, this report states that, for the same time period, 27.5 percent of American Samoan families were living in poverty, as compared to 9.6 percent for all American families. After the deep recession we experienced after 1980, these conditions could only be worse.

Because American Samoans who come to the United States, as is their right as citizens of the United States, tend to settle into existing Samoan communities in cities along the west coast and Hawaii, concentrated pockets of poverty have formed that American Samoans have great difficulty breaking out of. Providing job training and community development grants to these communities will help American

Samoans to overcome language and cultural barriers and improve their economic standing.

The U.S. Government has a special responsibility toward the American Samoan people due to the trust relationship established when the islands were ceded to the United States in the early 1900's. I believe that the number of American Samoans living in poverty in the United States demonstrates that we have not lived up to that responsibility. I hope that we can approve these simple measures with all due speed so that these American citizens can participate in the economic expansion that other Americans are enjoying. ●

#### THE TRI-STATE CONFERENCE ON STEEL

**HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the steel industry has spawned a remarkable assemblage of union workers, local government officials and grassroots activists dedicated to the preservation of the steel industry in western Pennsylvania.

Using public education techniques backed by solid research, the Tri-State Conference on Steel has helped shape debate on the direction State and local governments should be headed if steel's presence is to be maintained. I strongly endorse the Tri-State Conference's proposal for the creation of a "TVA for Steel." Unlike the Tennessee Valley Authority, the new "Steel Valley Authority" would be locally controlled, with a board of directors made up of workers, community residents, and local government officials. The Federal Government's role in the initial financing of such an authority would be key, just as it was for the Tennessee Valley Authority and, more recently, Conrail.

In recent months, the Tri-State Conference has pointed to the need for a regional approach to economic development in the western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia area. Essential to any recovery for this region, and I would point out to my colleagues that many communities in this area have yet to feel the recovery in any substantial way, is an increased demand for steel. I believe that the Federal Government, by embarking on a long-overdue effort to repair the roads, bridges, locks, dams, and other public infrastructure of the Nation, can help spur that demand. In the Tri-State area alone, at least 8 million tons of steel are needed to repair just the roads and bridges. Increased demand will, of course, require an increased supply of steel. We have the

capacity in the Tri-State area to supply a good part of the Nation's needs when it comes to steel. I can assure my colleagues that we have the workers and the plant capacity to aid in the rebuilding our Nation.

What is required is a national commitment to a rebuilding effort. The Tri-State Conference on Steel recognizes this and has called for just such an effort. I hope that this Congress will heed that call.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD material which describes the commendable work of the Tri-State Conference on Steel.

#### WHO IS THE "TRI-STATE"?

Tri-State Conference on Steel is a non-profit community based, public interest organization, located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania's economically depressed Monongahela (Mon) River Valley. The Conference was organized in response to the massive layoffs and plants closings in the steel industry of the Tri-State Area of Western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and northern West Virginia. Some of its founders, such as Rev. Charles Rawlings of the Episcopal Diocese of Ohio and the Ecumenical Interreligious Economic Crisis Organizing Network (I/ECON), and labor attorney Staughton Lynd were leaders in the struggles to save steelworkers' jobs in Youngstown, Ohio in 1977-79.

Tri-State Conference on Steel was organized in 1979 when the Youngstown activists allied themselves with local union and religious forces in Pittsburgh's Mon Valley. The original objectives of Tri-State were to spread the alarm throughout the Mon Valley regarding its soon expected abandonment by United States Steel Corporation and to develop a plan to save steel jobs and reindustrialize the region. Chief among organizers in the Pittsburgh area were: Mike Stout, Grievanceman, United Steelworkers of America, Local 1397 in Homestead; Jay Weinberg, Unemployed Committee Chairman, Local 1397; Charles McColester, Chief Steward, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers Union, Local 610 (UE), at Union Switch & Signal in Swissvale; Rev. Garrett Dorsey, Co-Administrator of St. Stephen R.C. Church in Hazelwood and present Chairman, Tri-State Conference on Steel; Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, noted area labor priest; Sr. Ligouri Rossner, Jubilee Soup Kitchen Administrator; Jim Benn, member Local 1256; Frank O'Brien, retired local steelworkers union president and former state legislator, and Professor Thomas Kerr, Chairman, Allegheny County Civil Rights Commission and Professor, Graduate School of Industrial Administration at Carnegie Mellon University.

After having initiated programs geared to securing political support for direct economic relief for laid off workers, regarding mortgage foreclosures, utility shutoffs and food shortage, Tri-State turned its attention to identifying and combating the root causes of the area's increasing economic dislocations, namely corporate disinvestment and capital flight. A more direct service oriented group then split off and founded the Mon Valley Unemployed Committee with assistance from the Tri-State Conference on Steel. Tri-State then began work on the development of an alternative economic revitalization plan for Mon Valley Steelmaking.

The recent history of United States Steel Corporation demonstrates that they are get-

ting out of basic steel production in the Mon Valley. Their December 27, 1983, shutdown announcement was simply more confirmation of the inevitable. Since the Mon Valley's steel industry is still very much needed to: save valley workers, families and communities from economic and social ruin; aid in repairing the region's crumbling public infrastructure and satisfy private market needs sure to emerge with the general "economic recovery"; and contribute to retaining a basic national industry; the present goals of Tri-State are:

(1) To develop a plan to revitalize Mon Valley steelmaking, a plan which is keyed to the purchase or eminent domain takeover of US Steel Corporation's Mon Valley Works by a regional steel authority representing Mon Valley workers and communities.

(2) To organize union, public and local government (borough, town, city councils) support for the revitalization "Plan" among Mon Valley communities and use it to secure assistance from Allegheny County, the State and Federal governments.

(3) To promote the "Plan" as a model for saving the steel industry throughout the Tri-State area and the nation, and in so doing, enlist broad political support for the "Plan", particularly in the US Congress.

(4) To become directly involved in organizing and operating the Mon Valley Steel Authority, through membership on its Board, in which worker/community representatives are to be the majority.

#### A "TVA" FOR STEEL

If the steel companies won't make the steel America needs, then we—the American people—must find a different way.

The Tri-State Conference on Steel (Pgh.) is proposing Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)-type approach to the steel industry in this area and other steel areas being abandoned. Some local USWA Unions, especially #1397 are joining in this call for trying this approach.

#### MARKETS FOR THE STEEL

At a time when our productive capacity in steel is being eliminated through mergers and shutdowns, the need for steel is growing at an annual rate of 1%. It has been estimated by the General Contractors of America (Wash., D.C.) that at least—three trillion dollars need to be spent over this decade to bring our nation's infrastructure up to standards. According to official sources every million dollars spent on infrastructure means 100,000 tons of steel are needed. In the Tri-State region alone, it is estimated that at least 8 million tons of steel will be needed just to repair the road and bridges. In this, the largest inland port in the USA, 16 locks and dams are substandard and in need of repair, and 80 high-hazard flood control and water reservoir dams have been classified as unsafe by the Army Corp of Engineers, severely restricting river traffic. A multi-million dollar coal contract to New England power companies was lost several years ago, because this area didn't have the rail facilities to move the coal.

A program to produce steel to repair our region's infrastructure is vital for developing our areas economic resources and opening up secondary markets. For instance, there are 500,000 billion tons of coal worth \$3 trillion lying dormant under our Tri-State region. Exploiting and selling the coal could potentially employ a half a million people a year.

The "Mon Valley Works"—with its massive plate, pipe, bar and structural mills is

perfectly suited for this type of steel production.

#### FINANCING/ORGANIZATION

Overall, the federal government should take ultimate responsibility for financing and backing such a public authority, just as it did for the TVA, and Conrail. Funding could also come from any combination of sources, including federal bonds, tax-exempt municipal or industrial bonds, tax credits, union pension funds, or guaranteed purchase agreements by the local, state and national government for infrastructure rebuilding.

But unlike the TVA or Conrail, the "SVA" should be more locally controlled, with a Board made up of worker, community and local government (Borough) representatives, as well as new management appointed by and responsible to the Board.

#### THE POWER OF "EMINENT DOMAIN"

Corporations like US Steel may never voluntarily sell its facilities to such an Authority—not when they can get big tax write-offs from shutting down.

The power of eminent domain is inherent in every government body in Pennsylvania. According to a State Law passed in 1945, The Municipal Authorities Act of Pa., even a tiny borough such as Homestead has the power to "condemn" an industrial facility and take it over to insure the public welfare. In fact, eminent domain was used in 1941, when the government took over the Homestead mill for the war effort and built the 45", 160", Forge, Machine Shop and OH5. It was also used to benefit Jones and Laughlin within Pittsburgh to provide expansion in the early fifties.

Eminent domain has been used to preserve forests and endangered wildlife, why shouldn't it be used to save our jobs and the Steel Industry? Is the question now being raised by the Tri-State Conference and union locals.

We are now taking our plan to the general public and the government officials of this area.

#### CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS TOWARD A STEEL VALLEY AUTHORITY

In September and October, 25 municipalities in the Steel Valley and Turtle Creek Council of Governments passed a Resolution calling for a feasibility study of the Mon Valley facilities being abandoned by U.S. Steel (USS) and other firms in the area. They also promoted the call for government intervention in the creation of markets.

In early October, USS announced it would begin dismantling the "hot end" of the Duquesne Works in 4 to 6 weeks, in order to begin construction of an industrial park. November 12th was announced as their target date for demolition.

On October 29, union, political, and community leaders met at the Swissvale Borough building to discuss the steps needed to launch a feasibility study and save the Duquesne works. Attorneys from Tri-State and the USWA International announced that they would request a court injunction if U.S. Steel could not be persuaded to halt demolition of Duquesne.

On November 7, a delegation representing the October 29th meeting presented Thomas Forester, Allegheny County Commissioner, with a proposal for a feasibility study, the first phase of which would be on the hot end works at the Duquesne Works.

On November 8, Allegheny County Commissioners met with officials from U.S. Steel

who agreed to a 30 day delay of the planned demolition. They also agreed to allow for a tour of these facilities.

On November 15, the Allegheny County Commissioners, international and local union officials, state and borough officials, and Tri-State conference representatives toured the Duquesne works and inspected the basic oxygen furnace shop, and the #6 blast furnace known as Dorothy. A representative of Locker/Albrecht Associates, a firm specializing in feasibility studies, found that the facilities were in excellent condition.

On November 19, the Munhall Borough Council passed a resolution of intent to establish a Steel Valley Authority and called on other boroughs and the county to join in this effort. On the same day, a representative from Data Resources, Inc. met with County Commissioners confirming that there is a profitable market for Duquesne, Homestead, and National steel products.

In early December, the County Solicitor informed the USWA and Tri-State that U.S. Steel would not extend the December 10th deadline to begin demolition of Duquesne's hot end works.

On December 5, U.S. Steel announced it would extend the deadline until February 2, 1985 after intervention of Representative Gaydos, County Commissioner Thomas Forester, and USWA President Lynn Williams.

On December 6th, County Commissioners announced that they would contribute \$50,000 for a feasibility study by Locker/Albrecht to examine the facilities, financing, redevelopment, and marketing for the continued operation of the Duquesne Works. The City of Pittsburgh and the USWA International also pledged \$50,000 each for the study.

On December 18th, a dozen members of the USWA Local #1256, representing the Duquesne workers, began weatherizing the Dorothy Six to prevent damage by the cold. For the first time in 20 years, the furnaces were not operating around the clock. Materials were provided by a \$20,000 grant from the USWA International. The workers volunteered their time and expertise to winterize the plant.

On January 2, 1985, over 200 people attended a town meeting of the Munhall Borough Council to consider the resolution to set up a Steel Valley Authority.

On January 7, the Turtle Creek Borough Council joined the councils of Munhall, Rankin, and Homestead by passing a resolution to establish their intent to create a Steel Valley Authority.

On January 17, the Munhall Borough Council voted unanimously to establish the Steel Valley Public Authority. It is the first borough to adopt Tri-State's plan.

On January 18, Democratic Presidential candidate Jesse Jackson endorsed the Tri-State Conference's plan at a rally in front of the Duquesne plant gates.●

#### ARCHBISHOP O'CONNOR: HOUSING AS A MORAL ISSUE

#### HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference and the National Conference of Catholic Charities, Archbishop O'Con-

nor testified before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development on March 7, 1985. The archbishop's testimony raised the issue of America's homeless as well as the current state of housing in America to a moral level.

The archbishop urged the committee to shift the emphasis from deficit reduction to the "basic needs of the American people." In his words: "ever growing numbers of people are being displaced because of arson, housing abandonment, gentrification and evictions. The Federal Government must assume an emergency posture in this connection, similar to a disaster caused by a flood or hurricane."

Ten years ago, the Catholic Bishops of the United States issued a pastoral letter entitled, "The Right to a Decent Home." Its first sentence read: "The United States is in the midst of a severe housing crisis". Recognizing that decent housing is a right, the bishops outlined the problems facing the Nation immediately following the Nixon housing moratorium and in particular reflected on the consequences of poor housing on the Nation. Sadly, 10 years later this pastoral letter is as accurate today as it was when first written. All that needs to be changed is the date.

As we begin the debate on the Federal Government's role in providing decent, safe and sanitary housing, I hope that my colleagues will have the chance to review the archbishop's words. As such, I would like to include two recent articles from the Catholic New York newsletter that summarize Archbishop O'Connor's testimony. I would also like to include another article on dilemma confronting our housing subcommittee chairman, Representative GONZALEZ as we consider the path we will follow during the next few months. In Chairman GONZALEZ' words the question we face is "whether to reaffirm or to deny basic (housing) programs and policies, some of which have been in place for almost 50 years."

[From the Catholic New York, Mar. 14, 1985]

A PLEA "IN CONSCIENCE"—WEIGH MILITARY SPENDING AGAINST HOUSING NEED, ARCHBISHOP URGES

(By Nancy Cullinane)

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, Archbishop O'Connor urged those who control the nation's purse strings to carefully weigh appropriations for defense spending against the urgent need for funding for decent housing.

"I spent some 27 years of my life in the uniform of this country that I love . . . serving those who were trying to protect the human person here and all over," said the archbishop, a former Navy chaplain.

"I respect the effort of the government to provide the defense that we need and deserve," he continued. "But I must plead in conscience—personally and as a bishop and

as a representative of the United States Catholic Conference. I want to go on record with a plea that every dollar budgeted for weapons systems be scrutinized with excruciating care, not only in terms of the morality of any intended use of such systems, but in terms of the urgent needs of some 35 million people in our society, hundreds of millions throughout the world, who are homeless, who are ill-housed, who are desperate for a restoration of the dignity, the sense of worth and sacredness that can come only with proper housing."

Archbishop O'Connor, who was accompanied to the March 7 hearing by Father Donald Sakano, director of the archdiocesan Office of Neighborhood Preservation, and Father Louis Gigante, president of SEBCO (Southeast Bronx Development Corp.), was one of a series of witnesses testifying in regard to H.R. 1, which would authorize \$22 billion for new low- and moderate-income housing. The legislation, sponsored by subcommittee chairman Henry Gonzalez (D-Texas), would restore some of the housing funds cut from the proposed 1986 budget, which virtually eliminates funds for new housing.

The budget calls for no increase in Section 8 vouchers, which provide rent assistance in existing housing; no new Section 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped; no additional public housing units for low- and moderate-income housing of any kind; and no funds to aid the homeless through the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration and operating subsidies for existing housing would be eliminated. Community Development Block Grants would be cut 10 percent.

The archbishop, who spoke on behalf of the USCC and the National Conference of Catholic Charities, said he was not testifying as an expert on housing legislation; rather, he was there as a person who has seen "what homelessness and poor housing can do to human dignity."

"I saw it in Vietnam," said the archbishop. "Their roots have been torn up . . . they became nomads.

"That chilled me," he said.

In Ethiopia, he said, there was a significantly higher mortality rate among people who had no shelter than those who at least had a small tent in which to live.

The situation is the same in the United States, said the archbishop. The number of homeless is placed at 250,000 and about 950,000 others are at risk of being homeless, he said.

These people are not necessarily derelicts or the de-institutionalized, he said. "I'm talking about normal families, normal individuals who are out on the streets."

The archbishop spoke extemporaneously, but his written statement and the U.S. bishops' 1975 pastoral letter, "The Right to a Decent Home," were entered into the record. Archbishop O'Connor noted that, unfortunately, the bishops' pastoral could not be updated to show improvements in the housing situation.

"I honestly don't believe it (the housing crisis) is a matter of budget," said the archbishop. "It's a matter of attitude and leadership."

A sensitivity to human needs should "pervade our economic planning," he explained. He noted that there was a "tremendous amount of ingenuity and enough genius" in the U.S. military to discover how to develop weapons systems at a lesser cost.

The archbishop reaffirmed the Church's commitment to work for better housing, but emphasized that it could not do it alone.

"We seek . . . we offer a partnership" with the government, he said.

Committee members, including Rep. Robert Garcia, a Democrat whose South Bronx district is among the poorest in the nation, praised Archbishop O'Connor for making the housing issue a moral imperative.

Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio) pressed the archbishop on his statement regarding military spending.

"If I were a member of Congress," said the archbishop, there would be "no question about the moral thing to do."

He said, "Given the present crisis, I have to say it's wrong" to increase defense spending, but not housing allocations.

Father Gigante's testimony illustrated the increasing demand for decent housing and how a community group can become self-sufficient if given assistance by the government.

"I did not get involved in housing because I wanted to be a developer," he said. Rather, it was a result of a need for affordable housing in the Southeast Bronx.

SEBCO has opened three senior citizens residences and 3,000 low-income housing units. It has building maintenance and security programs that are profitable. Other parishes, using SEBCO as a model, have opened about 13,000 more units.

When SEBCO made its first 300 apartments available, 1,500 families applied, Father Gigante said. Recently, 190 apartments were made available, and SEBCO received 7,000 requests. The agency received about 25 to 30 additional requests a day for housing.

"Ninety-nine percent of the people who apply are in need," said Father Gigante.

Father Gigante pleaded that programs to produce housing be maintained. A moratorium on housing starts imposed by President Nixon in 1973 set housing improvement programs back five years and cost New York City 35,000 jobs, he said.

"If this Congress goes along with this president's approach, you can see seven more years of nothing happening," he said. "To eliminate a production program would be foolish."

Father Gigante also asked that social service programs be continued, explaining that SEBCO provides at least one social worker per housing project to help residents cope with problems inherent to poor housing.

After the hearing, Father Sakano told Catholic New York that H.R. 1 probably does not have the support it needs among members of Congress. He explained that money for new housing has been reduced drastically in the past five years, though the numbers of people who need appropriate housing has increased. In 1981, the budget for new housing was \$30 billion; the 1986 budget allocates about \$10 billion. Though H.R. 1 would improve the situation somewhat, it still is not enough to offset the growing need, he said.

[From the Catholic New York, Mar. 7, 1985]  
**"CRITICAL NEEDS"—ARCHBISHOP O'CONNOR  
 URGES GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR LOW-  
 INCOME HOUSING**

(By Paul Joly)

Crumbling plaster is a tragic cause behind the crumbling lives of too many people living in city slums and rural shacks across America, Archbishop O'Connor said in testi-

mony prepared for a congressional committee.

Residents of substandard housing surrounded constantly by filth and destruction are likely to develop a sense of hopelessness, according to the archbishop. Every day their surroundings tell them they are worthless, breeding violence and apathy, he indicated.

Archbishop O'Connor presented his testimony on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference and the National Conference of Catholic Charities before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in Washington, March 7.

He proposed that attention be shifted from deficit-reducing strategies "to the basic needs of the American people."

"We need to center ourselves on the plight of those who are not faring well in this economy," the archbishop said. "We need to take an accurate accounting of our most critical needs and then plan how we are to spend our vital resources to meet those needs."

Archbishop O'Connor did not endorse or criticize any particular political agenda, but he called the allocation of funds for low-income housing "primarily a federal responsibility."

The Reagan administration has argued that such concerns as housing are more effectively and appropriately handled by local governments.

"The program budgets of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Farmers Home Administration, and the Department of Agriculture have already taken more of the budget cuts since 1981 than any other human service," Archbishop O'Connor said.

"Ever growing numbers of people are being displaced because of arson, housing abandonment, gentrification, and evictions. The federal government must assume an emergency posture in this connection, similar to a disaster caused by a flood or hurricane," he said.

Nationally, the Catholic Church and other churches and church agencies have long taken a leading role in housing work, the archbishop told the committee. "We have used our Church resources in conjunction with state, local, and federal funds to construct thousands of units of low-rent housing, to rehabilitate church buildings to house the homeless, and to develop congregate housing for the elderly," he said.

Using New York as an example, Archbishop O'Connor told the legislators about the archdiocese's recently-established housing fund.

"Using \$1 million of our own funds, we are leveraging this money by challenging the public sector and other religious institutions as well as the private sector, to make contributions in the form of low-interest loans," he explained.

"We are making these funds available to limited-equity cooperative housing groups supported by community-based organizations. These organizations are working with low income people, giving them assistance to accomplish homesteading—through 'sweat equity'—in abandoned buildings in the Lower East Side, East Harlem, the South Bronx, and the Northwest Bronx," he said.

But, Archbishop O'Connor told the committee, "as important as these efforts of the Church are, our experience in the field makes us deeply aware that the needs are of such great magnitude that we cannot undertake the task alone."

The archbishop used a personal anecdote to illustrate his statement that "a truly just society is judged by how it protects and cares for its most vulnerable and least powerful members."

"I often ponder this when I gaze out of my window in my residence behind St. Patrick's Cathedral," he said. "There on Madison Avenue, across the street from the soaring new Palace Hotel, amidst the fine shops and long limousines I see the homeless. I see in their frightened faces the look of abandonment and despair."

"America has always been a land of hope and opportunity. It is also a land of wonderful generosity," he observed. "As thousands and even millions of people continue to live in substandard housing, or have no housing at all, we Americans, stewards of the greatest economy the world has ever known, must resolve to put an end to this injustice."

Archbishop O'Connor drew from principles enunciated in a 1975 statement by the U.S. bishops entitled, "The Right to a Decent Home." He also quoted from Scripture and referred to Catholic social teachings that call for a "preferential option for the poor."

Emergency shelters should not be considered as a permanent or long-term solution to the housing problem, he said.

The U.S. Catholic Conference and the National Conference of Catholic Charities is recommending five specific policies for Congress to adopt. According to Archbishop O'Connor's testimony, these are:

"Public housing must be considered an entitlement for all who need it."

Public housing must be adequately assisted through operating subsidies and modernization funds."

"A new production program should be launched to meet the critical housing shortage in the nation."

"Displacement of low-income people should be prevented."

"The fair housing laws and equal opportunity requirements should be strengthened and enforced."

[From the Catholic New York, Mar. 14, 1985]

**A CONGRESSMAN'S DILEMMA—HENRY GONZALEZ FIGHTS FOR HOUSING FUNDS IN BUDGET-CONSCIOUS WASHINGTON**

(By Nancy Cullinane)

The 1984 Almanac of American Politics describes Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D-Texas) as a man who "does not find it easy to compromise or to wheel and deal."

This stubbornness—the Almanac calls it "adherence to principle"—is being put to the test in his role as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development. A fervent advocate of housing programs, Gonzalez leads his subcommittee at a time when federal budget allocations for such assistance are being dramatically reduced in the administration's zeal to trim the federal deficit while shoring up the national defense.

He has fought back by sponsoring a bill, H.R. 1, which would restore about \$22 billion in housing assistance funds to the 1986 budget. But observers on Capitol Hill are not optimistic about its success, and Gonzalez himself admits that the legislation only provides "minimal" assistance.

"The question is whether to reaffirm or to deny the basic programs and policies, some of which have been in place for almost 50 years," Gonzalez remarked at a March 7 hearing on H.R. 1. Among the witnesses that day was Archbishop O'Connor.

"I'm grateful to you," he told the archbishop, "because you, for the first time here today, set forth the fact that housing is a basic human right."

The dilemma, Gonzalez said, is that "some of us who have supported, advocated such things as public housing have been the subject to the charge of being big spenders." But he pointed out, "The cost of 23 B-1 bombers would underwrite the entire budgetary cost of our housing assistance program."

"What kind of perversity of priorities is in order here?" he asked.

The words can be considered bold for a congressman whose hometown, San Antonio, depends upon the U.S. military for its economic mainstay. San Antonio has Fort Sam Houston, the Brooks Aero Medical Center (the major medical facility of the Air Force) and about three other Air Force bases within the city limits or just outside them. But paradoxes have followed Gonzalez's career.

A strong Catholic, Gonzalez, 68, was elected to the House of Representatives in 1961 after serving on the city council, as mayor pro-tem and as a state senator. He was one of the few Mexican-American politicians at the time and was considered to be the typical Texas liberal. But he alienated many liberals and Chicano activists when he staunchly defended U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war.

If political wounds were inflicted, they apparently were not too deep, because Gonzalez has easily been re-elected.

Gonzalez will come to New York March 15 to gather further evidence to persuade his Congressional colleagues to keep housing programs alive. He will lead a delegation to the Bronx to view neighborhoods revitalized by SEBCO, the southeast Bronx development company headed by Father Louis Gigante, who also testified before the subcommittee.

Said Gonzalez, "Yes, there is a responsibility to see that the (housing) programs and policies . . . continue to merit support. That's one thing. But to kill them . . . without consideration and debate and evaluation of the basis of merit or demerit, I think is very wrong." ●

#### REGISTRY DATE NEEDED

**HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to permit all aliens who have continuously resided in this country since 1976, regardless of status, the right to apply for the establishment of a registry date for their permanent resident status in the United States. I believe that this approach is a far more reasonable answer to the amnesty question than the blanket solution proposed by the omnibus immigration packages considered by this body during the past two Congresses. Unlike what we tried to do last year, this legislation has precedent in our immigration law, and it rewards those who have already become integrated into our society.

We in the Congress have always recognized the fact that people enter this

country through a variety of methods, and over time many of them make their home here, raise their children here, and ultimately become taxpaying contributors to American pluralism. Long ago we decided that those who lived here continuously since 1924 should be directly eligible for American citizenship, and that for them, the normal 5-year waiting period should be waived.

The concept of a registry date was established in 1929, when immigration records were poor, and it then applied to persons who had lived here continuously since 1921. This registry date has been moved up several times since, the last time in 1965, when the cutoff date was set at June 30, 1948. In 1982, the first omnibus immigration bill contained language which would have substituted January 1, 1973 for the 1948 date. When H.R. 1510 passed the House last year, identical language was included in section 302 of title III. The legislation I am introducing today seeks to make similar changes to an outmoded eligibility date, without the added burden of an omnibus bill.

In addition it seems appropriate, that 1976, the "Bicentennial Year," be chosen for the new registry date since that date recalls our earlier new found freedom as a nation, just as this new registry date will, if enacted, mark the date of a new found freedom for those immigrants otherwise eligible. ●

#### SHEVCHENKO TESTIMONY

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last week Arkady Shevchenko, who spent more than two decades working inside the Soviet Foreign Ministry, appeared as a witness before the Defense Policy Panel of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Shevchenko entered the Soviet Foreign Service as an arms control specialist and worked on much of the Soviet Union, arms control policies, including that SALT I negotiations. With that background, he brings a unique perspective when we in the United States try to divine what the Soviets are up to when they sit down at the negotiating table.

The committee is processing the transcript from that hearing now, but I thought it would be useful to share with my colleagues immediately the text of Mr. Shevchenko's opening remarks to the panel.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen:

First of all, I would like to express to the members of this panel and particularly to the Chairman, Congressman Les Aspin, my gratitude and appreciation for inviting me

to give this testimony. I am very proud to participate in the work of the Committee and will do my best to answer all questions as completely as possible.

Today, March 12 marks the resumption of negotiations in Geneva—or as the Soviet leadership describes them, the “new negotiations” on a “complex of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons, both strategic and intermediate range”—as was agreed upon last January when Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Gromyko met.

I am neither pessimistic nor optimistic about the final outcome of these negotiations. After all, we are now at an initial stage of negotiating with the Soviet Union. But the Soviet leadership's willingness to resume negotiations is in itself a welcome turn toward more constructive conduct after the breakdown of negotiations following the Soviet walkout from the previous talks. In my view, Konstantin Chernenko's death and the selection of Gorbachev as the new Party leader is most unlikely to affect the Soviet position because, for a long time already, there has been a collective leadership in the Kremlin.

We should not be misled by recent Soviet attacks against U.S. policy in arms reduction. Regarding foreign policy generally and disarmament in particular, the Soviet Union has always taken a double-track approach: propaganda bluster on one hand, coupled with realistic talks on the other.

The Soviet Union is certainly attempting to split NATO and put the President, the Congress and the American people at odds. Soviet leaders know that negotiations tend to have a calming effect. There are already demands to stop some or all military programs because some people believe that we have to make unilateral concessions even before coming to the negotiating table. This approach is wrong and even dangerous. I know from my own experience in the Soviet Government that it sees this attitude very clearly and has become expert at playing upon fears that feed so naturally upon other fears.

While I participated in the elaboration of Soviet policy, I learned that it has never been Soviet strategy to make concessions at the beginning of negotiations. The USSR would traditionally set a non-realizable objective and later try to sell any compromise for the highest possible price.

There are now both domestic and external pressures on the Soviet leadership to enter into serious negotiations on arms reduction. I believe that any opportunities for verifiable agreements on arms reductions between the USSR and the United States that are in the best interest of our security should not be missed. As I learned over many years, the Soviet Union believes that one of America's weaknesses is that it is very difficult for the U.S. Government to develop a bipartisan policy toward negotiations with it on arms control and disarmament. In the past, the Soviet leaders have turned this to their advantage. They will attempt to do so again. I think that we have to at least try—within the framework of our free democratic society—to elaborate tactics and strategy with the broadest possible support of different political forces in the country under the leadership of President Reagan and the Congress, and the participation of those who have had experience in negotiating with the Soviets. Such support may be difficult to organize but it is worthwhile to make the effort.

According to what I know, anyone seeking to negotiate with Moscow on arms control

must bear in mind the following two considerations:

First: if we make unilateral concessions, the Kremlin will simply escalate its demands. Therefore, we should not make concessions up front. And second: if we try to impose something on the Soviet leaders, this tactic would probably result in a stalemate. It would likely push the Soviet leaders into a fortress mentality that may lead them to both greater repression at home and more dangerous adventures abroad.●

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS SUPPORT SDI: THE STAR WARS ARGUMENT COMES FULL CIRCLE

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the column by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr., in the March 4 Washington Post makes three very important points about the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], more popularly known to most critics and even some proponents as star wars. Mr. Tyrrell mentions his own uneasiness about sticking with the present “predicament of Mutually Assured Destruction [MAD].” Certainly, whether we are SDI supporters and/or Members with concerns about arms control, we should be alarmed about the prospects of remaining wed to a doctrine which depends on the threat of mutual annihilation for stability.

The column also points out that certain advocates of a nuclear freeze have indicated some support for the SDI, namely, Freeman Dyson in his thoughtful book, “Weapons and Hope,” and Jonathan Shell, who has been very much involved in the nuclear winter debate.

Finally, Mr. Tyrrell remarks on one of the great inconsistencies of the scientific critics of SDI who are so certain it will not work. Generally before Committees of the Congress, these are the same people who profess boundless optimism about scientific and technological possibilities and yet we see no scientific basis for their pessimism about SDI's prospects. There is no evidence that meeting SDI systems requirements would violate physical laws.

I strongly recommend this thought-provoking column to my colleagues in the House.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1985]

STAR WARS VS. THE FREEZE

(By R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.)

In one of the earliest and most readable polemics on behalf of the Star Wars antimissile defense system: “A Defense That Defends,” the authors, retired Army lieutenant general Daniel O. Graham and Gregory Fossedal, argue that the Star Wars defense will put the kibosh to the nuclear freeze movement. At first glance the nuclear freeze movement is as welcome as a

sonnet about your Easter bonnet, but when one recalls that this is 1985 and the freeze's proponents have ignored the Soviet Union's record of bellicosity, not to mention the historic weakness of dictatorships for violent discontinuities, one gets somewhat uneasy about freezing us into the present predicament of Mutual Assured Destruction.

The freeze movement is a dangerous delusion. Moreover there is growing evidence that Graham and Fossedal were correct in their prediction. Spring approaches. Interest in Star Wars grows. And the freeze movement seems to be losing enthusiasts, notwithstanding the fact that springtime is that time of year when the freezeniks have heretofore grown particularly frisky.

Recall if you will the spring of 1982, when 500,000 of them gathered in Central Park, and 11 gathered in Moscow. The Moscow 11 were promptly charged with “hooliganism,” and their spokesman was packed off to a “psychiatric hospital.” Did a similar fate befall Central Park's 500,000?

Doubtless, there are some among us who would believe that Ronald Reagan's agents have had a hand in the freeze movement's loss of popularity, but they might look deeper. From the start the movement has been unrealistic.

Its proponents ignored Soviet capacity for technical development. They ignored the dyspeptic nature of the Soviets and the worldwide trend toward nuclear proliferation, a proliferation that we can prevent for only so long.

In sum, the freeze movement was escapist, pretending as it did that the United States could isolate itself from the outside world and from the ongoing rush of history. The idea seemed to be that the United States could keep pretty much to itself, and that no new power would develop nuclear weaponry and become disagreeable. The United States and the Soviet Union would agree to freeze their nuclear arsenals and history would freeze with them.

Yet now an eminent old man has come up with a new idea. Ronald Reagan's Star Wars plan would insulate us from the inevitable nuclear proliferation not by pretending that this proliferation is not occurring but by developing weapons to blunt its effect. Instead of attempting to change the intentions of would-be aggressors, we shall change our policies so that whatever another's intentions might be, he can no longer destroy us.

One of the unanswered mysteries of the present is how it took a 74-year-old president to come up with this splendid new idea. How has he managed to get so many of the clock-stoppers in the arms control business to ponder it?

Another mystery is why those who oppose it are so certain it will not work. These people frequently display great optimism about the capacities of science and technology. Yet when it comes to Star Wars they become yahoos and swear that it cannot be done.

Now of course even some freezeniks think Star Wars can prevent the nuclear holocaust they fear. Freeman Dyson in his book, “Weapons and Hope,” says as much; and now Jonathan Shell is rethinking his earlier criticism of Star Wars. He has told Fossedal that if building the “shield” of Star Wars allowed us to reduce our offensive weaponry he would see merit in the policy.

Thus within the freeze movement a split grows. Shell and his supporters argue that the preferred goal is total disarmament of nuclear weapons. They see Star Wars as a plausible instrument toward that goal.

Others like Paul Warnke, Jimmy Carter's arms control negotiator, argue that the goal should be a freeze codifying the balance of terror. What we have here is the lively possibility of a coalition between conservative advocates of Star Wars and freezemen like Schell.

Graham and Fossedal predicted it in their interesting book, and as spring approaches, the prospects increase. ●

### H.R. 945, FIREARMS OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT

**HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, since my reintroduction of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act, H.R. 945, over 100 of my colleagues have cosponsored this legislation. They joined in support of this legislation because they recognize it is needed.

They recognize its need for refocusing the law's impact upon the criminal element of our society and away from bureaucratic regulation of law-abiding citizens. They realize the bill will close loopholes that currently exist so that it will be more difficult for criminals to obtain firearms while cutting through redtape the average citizen or businessman has to put up with.

Today, I wish to share with all Members, by placing in the RECORD letters I have received from various State organizations of sportsmen who have written in support of this legislation. I appreciate their support. I believe all Members can identify with their comments.

UNIFIED SPORTSMEN OF FLORIDA,  
Tallahassee, FL, February 14, 1985.

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER,  
U.S. Congress, 2411 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOLKMER: On behalf of the full statewide membership of Unified Sportsmen of Florida, I would like to thank you for the introduction of H.R. 945, The Firearm Owners' Protection Act. Your efforts on behalf of law abiding sportsmen and firearm owners everywhere are greatly appreciated.

It is our understanding and belief that the reforms contained in H.R. 945 are needed to restore basic civil rights which all citizens take for granted, but which all too often have been ignored when put in the context of firearm ownership.

We further believe that H.R. 945 is also a balanced piece of legislation. It serves legitimate law enforcement by focusing enforcement of our nations laws upon the criminal, and away from the regulation of law abiding citizens by bureaucrats.

H.R. 945 also clarifies inconsistencies and vague provisions of current federal law which have provided no guidance to the general public and law enforcement alike.

I offer, on behalf of Unified Sportsmen of Florida, any help which my organization may be able to lend in your effort to protect law abiding citizens.

Thank you for your efforts in our behalf.  
Sincerely,

MARION P. HAMMER,  
Executive Director.

LOUISIANA SHOOTING ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, LA, March 11, 1985.

HON. HAROLD VOLKMER,  
2465 Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VOLKMER: House Resolution No. 945, The Firearms Owners Protection Act, prompts this letter.

We support it and encourage your efforts towards its passage.

You have the interests of the law abiding gun owners in mind and we realize that there have been some rough moments in previous sessions concerning your bill.

Our purpose is to let you know that we support and appreciate your efforts and will be grateful to you when it becomes law, hopefully, without encumbering amendments.

Thank you for your considerable time and effort spent in support of the legitimate gun owner.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. THERIOT,  
President, LSA.

SOUTH CAROLINA SHOOTING ASSOCIATION,  
Columbia, SC, March 5, 1985.

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER,  
U.S. House of Representatives, 2411 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VOLKMER: The South Carolina Shooting Association, the "umbrella" organization for the shooting sports and related activities in our State, strongly supports the 1985 Firearms Owners' Protection Act. On behalf of South Carolina's 200,000+ licensed hunters, 37,000+ organized shooters and enthusiasts, and many hundreds of thousands of other law-abiding firearms owners, we commend you for introducing this vital legislation in the United States House of Representatives.

We believe that the Act is urgently needed to protect the constitutional rights of our Nation's citizens. The provision limiting criminal prosecution under current Federal firearms law to willful violations is obviously necessary and long overdue. Criminal prosecution of otherwise law-abiding citizens based on unintentional technical violations violates the very spirit of that for which America stands—yet the history of enforcement of current Federal firearms law is filled with examples of such prosecution (or persecution).

Similarly, the provision pertaining to interstate transportation of firearms is clearly necessitated by the experiences of all-too-many law-abiding firearms owners and the clear and present dangers posed by conflicting state laws. For example, a number of South Carolinians transporting their firearms in a lawful manner in this State have been arrested after crossing the North Carolina border because the methods for lawfully transporting firearms in a vehicle in our State violates the law across the border. One could also recount the horror stories (true, unfortunately) concerning hunters, competitive shooters, and others traveling through New York City, the District of Columbia, and other areas to participate in lawful activities and with absolutely no intent to violate any law. The record provides overwhelming evidence in support of the Act.

Thank you for your courageous stand in support of the Constitution and the rights of law-abiding citizens. We sincerely hope that every member of our State's House Delegation gives the Act his active, total support at every step of the process through passage.

Sincerely,

HERBERT A. LANFORD, JR.,  
Vice President, SCSA. ●

### IMPORT RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN SHOE INDUSTRY

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the American nonrubber footwear industry is facing a life threatening crisis. The industry is threatened by lesser priced imports, which are currently estimated to take up 70 percent of the domestic market. In December, I had the opportunity to visit Sylvania shoe factory at McSheerstown, PA, where workers have had to cut back on hours and accept wages barely above the minimum required by law in an effort to keep the factory running. In the past year, some 89 shoe factories nationwide were forced to shut their doors, putting thousands out of work.

Last year, the U.S. International Trade Commission rules on a petition put forward by the industry under section 201 of the 1974 Trade Act, finding that the industry suffered no harm from imports despite the massive closings and the large share of the market taken up by imports! Consequently, the criteria of section 201 were modified by Congress in the last days of the 98th Congress and the Commission has reopened its investigation of harm done to the industry by imports.

In an effort to encourage the Commission, I, together with a large number of my colleagues from Pennsylvania, sent a letter to Commission Chairman Alfred Eckes. I would like to submit a copy of that letter for the RECORD and to encourage my colleagues from other concerned States to also express their support for the American shoe industry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 1985.

HON. ALFRED ECKES,  
Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to express our support for the International Trade Commission's decision to begin a new investigation of injury caused by imports to the American nonrubber footwear industry.

In Pennsylvania, we are witnessing first hand the damage done to the domestic footwear industry by less expensive imports. In 1984, some 89 footwear factories were forced to close nationwide, almost 10% of which were in Pennsylvania. The industry estimates that 70% of the U.S. market is now taken up by imports, and that nationwide

this has added an additional 27,000 to the unemployment lines; this is occurring in an industry which has already cut its employees' pay to just above the minimum wage.

It is our hope that the Commission will give the broadest possible interpretation to the modified criteria of Section 201 of the 1974 Trade Act in favor of the American shoe industry. The threat to the industry is real; and if the Commission should fail to recognize this threat, further legislative action may be necessary. We must act now to help revitalize this major American industry.

With all best wishes, we are,

Respectfully,

Bill Goodling, M.C., Senator John Heinz, Senator Arlen Specter, Joseph M. Gaydos, M.C., John P. Murtha, M.C., Douglas Walgren, M.C.,

William F. Clinger, Jr., M.C., William J. Coyne, M.C., Thomas M. Foglietta, M.C., Joseph P. Kolter, M.C., Austin J. Murphy, M.C., and

Gus Yatron, M.C., William H. Gray III, M.C., Thomas J. Ridge, M.C., Lawrence R. Coughlin, M.C., Robert W. Edgar, M.C., Paul E. Kanjorski, M.C., Peter H. Kostmayer, M.C., Robert S. Walker, M.C., Joseph M. McDade, M.C., Robert A. Borski, Jr., M.C., George W. Gekas, M.C., and Bud Shuster, M.C. ●

#### NICARAGUA IS ARMED FOR TROUBLE

#### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, for those who may not have seen the March 11, 1985, edition of the Wall Street Journal, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkable article by John F. Guilmartin, Jr., entitled "Nicaragua Is Armed for Trouble." Mr. Guilmartin is adjunct professor of history at Rice University in Houston and was formerly a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Air Force and editor of the Air University Review.

Before this year is out, this Congress will vote on whether or not to resume aid to the Contras who are trying to recover Nicaragua for its people. Not only the Contras and the others who seek freedom in Nicaragua will be watching our action but all of Central America, whose liberty could ultimately be in jeopardy if we fail to take a stand.

If anyone has any doubt about the intentions of the Sandinista regime, let him or her read this article carefully. A time bomb is ticking away for us in this hemisphere. Our failure to act now on behalf of these freedom fighters could cost us dearly later.

The article follows:

#### NICARAGUA IS ARMED FOR TROUBLE

(By John F. Guilmartin, Jr.)

Remember last year's controversy over the alleged delivery of MiG fighters to Nicaragua? Once it was established that what ac-

tually had been delivered were helicopters and not MiGs, almost no one bothered to ask what 12 fast, sophisticated, well-armed, long-range helicopter gunships could do to the armed forces of Central America or what their arrival might represent in terms of Sandinista strategy.

Shortly before the U.S. elections, media reports surfaced of a Soviet freighter bound from the Black Sea with a cargo of large boxes that, according to reconnaissance satellites, included those of a type used to ship jet fighter aircraft. Though reports were equivocal, concern mounted about the cargo and its destination. The most likely candidate was supersonic MiG-21s: High-technology warning bells went off in U.S. news rooms.

As the ship neared Nicaragua's Pacific port of Corinto (and as the U.S. election neared) speculation ran at fever pitch.

The bubble of fevered speculation burst with an anticlimactic "pop" when Sandinista Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto announced, in a statement more or less confirmed by official U.S. spokesmen, that the crates contained not MiGs, but other arms including helicopters. The news was all the more anticlimactic because an earlier shipment of Soviet helicopters apparently had been unloaded, all but unremarked, on Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast the previous week. The helicopters were Mi-24 "Hinds," the world's most heavily armed, sophisticated and fastest gunship. It is likely the second shipment of crates contained additional Hinds. The copters received scant attention, as did the possibility that the crates might also contain Czech L39Z jet trainers. The U.S. media and many in the Reagan administration heaved an almost audible sigh of relief.

#### THEY LOOKED FOOLISH

That sigh was shared by many: Those who saw only self-defense in Sandinista actions and read Moscow's behavior as an understandable defensive bolstering of a like-minded regime under pressure could point to the substitution of helicopters for MiGs as concrete evidence to support their views. Those who distrusted the Sandinistas and read the worst into the situation could view the delivery of helicopters, or jet trainers, as far less destabilizing than that of high-performance jet fighters.

Pentagon and White House spokesmen looked foolish. Having warned us to expect the worst, they had little to say when their MiGs vanished in a puff of smoke, to be replaced by hypothetical trainers and unimpressive-looking rotorcraft.

In fact, while the introduction by the Soviet bloc of high-performance jet fighters into Central America would pose a very real threat that posed by Mi-24s and L39Zs is hardly less serious, particularly if backed up later by fast-moving MiGs.

The MiG-22 is fast—Mach 2 plus to be exact. It has an excellent rate of climb and a respectably tight turn radius. Flown by a well-trained and experienced pilot, it is a dangerous opponent in a dogfight for the best the West has to offer. It has limited air-to-ground capability, but this is a deficiency for which L39Zs and Mi-24s can make up in spades.

The tactical success in Vietnam of our gunships—all far less sophisticated than the Mi-24—speaks for itself. The apparent lack of Mi-24 successes in Afghanistan is explainable on several grounds: The high, thin, Afghan air robs turbine engines of their power and rotor blades of lift, making helicopter operations a marginal proposi-

tion, particularly in summer. Forced by limited power to fly low along valleys, helicopters are vulnerable to plunging fire from the peaks and ridgelines above. Afghanistan is not a fair test for the Hind.

But over rolling jungle terrain at low altitudes, the Hind is in its element. Its impressive underwing ordnance (it can carry in excess of 2,800 pounds of 57-mm rockets, bombs and precision-guided antitank missiles) and its sophisticated turret-mounted rotary 12.7-mm gun make it a flexible and thoroughly capable weapons system. Its fire-controlled system is both sophisticated and reliable. Unlike Western gunships, it can carry from six to eight troops.

Pitted against the feeble or nonexistent anti-aircraft defenses of the non-communist Central American powers, the Hind represents an awesome capability, with or without top cover from MiGs. Flying low beneath the thin radar net and hugging the terrain, it can slip into neighboring countries with impunity. It can attack patrols and border posts with surgical precision, going as slow as necessary to do the job.

In the down and dirty game of slipping across a border, bagging a Honduran or Salvadoran C-47, and slipping back, all underneath radar coverage and hence undetected, the Mi-24 would be supreme. Distances are short in Central America and high speed counts for little; the terrain is rugged and the ability to hide within it weighs heavily. Able to hug terrain contours better than any fixed-wing fighter, and with a gun and fire control system more than adequate for the demands of the job, the Hind would be very difficult to counter. For a competent Hind crew, the ancient UH-1 "Huey" troop carrier helicopters and makeshift gunships with which we supply our Central American friends would be cold meat on the table.

Nor are the solutions simple. In its own, low-altitude environment, the Hind shows every evidence of being able to take care of itself against high-performance fighters. Down low, where the Hind and its targets live, it can out-turn the jet fighter, out-jink and out-accelerate the jet, and almost always bring its turreted nose gun to bear. True, it cannot pursue the fighter up into its performance envelope, but it has no need to do so. Interrupted, say, while attacking a Honduran or Salvadoran outpost or destroying a Miskito Indian village, the Hind is perfectly capable of giving as good as it is likely to get from any high-performance fighter around. Nor is this speculation; reports have come out of the Persian Gulf War of Iraqi Hinds engaging in dogfights with Iranian F-4 Phantoms flown by U.S.-trained pilots, and winning.

The thought of a surprise helicopter assault on the small Honduran or Salvadoran air force (Costa Rica has no armed forces) is a chilling one. Even viewed in isolation, the Hinds and L39Zs represent a formidable offensive threat. But when seen as components of a Soviet-style offensive force centered on at least 150 tanks and 200 other armored vehicles spearheading an army larger than that of any of its neighbors, augmented by a sophisticated ground-based anti-aircraft system, boasting SAM-7s, radar-directed 57-mm guns and highly mobile ZSU 23-4s, the implications of their arrival in Nicaragua are chilling. With the delivery of high-performance MiGs for top cover and deep interdiction strikes, the classic Soviet-style blitzkrieg package will be complete.

In all of this, we have missed something important. It is not that acceptance by the U.S. media, if not the Reagan administra-

tion, of the delivery of jet trainers and helicopters to Nicaragua has established a precedent for the subsequent delivery of MiGs. That is valid as far as it goes. The real point is twofold: The L39Zs and Mi-24s, particularly the latter, represent a major threat in themselves. Second, their arrival must be viewed as one more piece of a greater puzzle, the formation in Central America of a classic Soviet-style offensive combined arms team. And make no mistake: The Soviet doctrinal model, which the Sandinistas are clearly following, is inherently offensive in nature.

The initial MiG statement by U.S. aides came on Nov. 2. By Nov. 18, the Sandinista ambassador to Spain, Orlando Castillo, told reporters his government's position: No, Nicaragua did not have MiGs—yet. Yes, it had very intention of obtaining some as soon as it could—for self-defense! Thus the impending arrival of the last piece of the puzzle was announced.

#### EFFECTIVE FOR OFFENSE

Now, four months later, as we wait for the other shoe to drop, we are confronted by the release of a report last week by the council on Hemispheric Affairs assuring us that the Sandinista buildup is intended only to counter a feared U.S. invasion—and an essential corollary—that it is offensively impotent. Pointing to the handful of Honduran Mysteres, supplemented by Korean War vintage F-86s, the report concludes that the Sandinistas are totally outclassed in the air, which they well may be if the Hinds are obliging enough to climb up into the stratosphere where the aging Honduran fighters can strut their stuff. If the Hinds stay in their own tactical environment, the Hondurans or Salvadorans will be hard pressed to deal with them. The U.S. should move quickly to counter the Hinds by supplying both nations with Huey Cobra AH 1S helicopter gunships.

The real issue is that the Hinds are integral components of an inherently offensive arms package. To explain them away as defensive, we must similarly explain away the Soviet-supplied tanks and armored personnel carriers in Nicaragua. These are useless against a full-scale U.S. supported invasion, but highly effective for offensive use against opponents with inadequate air power.

A lot of our media have been finessed: overlooking the geographic and operational realities of Central America, they have focused on the icing—the MiGs—and missed the fact that a Soviet-style offensive arms cake has been baked beneath our noses. MiGs or no MiGs, the uncomfortable fact is that the Sandinistas have high-performance fighters—but with rotors rather than wings and with turboshaft engines in place of after-burning jets.●

#### TEACHERS—GOING THE EXTRA MILE FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

**HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker. At a recent National Education Association luncheon I attended, Jolene Franken, a first grade teacher in Denison, IA, made sure that I received an analysis

of a survey she conducted among teachers in the Lincolnway Uniserv Unit in western Iowa. I reviewed the analysis later that day and found myself forcefully reminded of a fact we sometimes forget in our haste to create a host of programs for fostering excellence in education. No program is as important or effective as a dedicated teacher. No program can begin to give to each of our students and to the quality of education as a whole in our Nation as much as teachers have given and continue to give of themselves—of time, or energy, of skills, patience, and knowledge, and even of money—to ensure that each child is receiving the best possible education. I hope that my colleagues will take time to read Jolene Franken's survey results and to reflect upon what they say about the quality of our nation's teachers:

My name is Jolene Franken. I am a first grade teacher in Denison, Iowa. Teaching has been my profession for seventeen years. Currently, I am President of the Lincolnway Uniserv Unit in Western Iowa. I am representing approximately 2,000 certified educators.

I am proud to be a teacher! I love teaching! My feelings are shared by a vast majority of the teachers of Iowa. Someone once told me that you go into teaching for the gratification of helping children learn; that the gratification compensates for the lower pay of teachers.

Every teacher has unforgettable moments—when that Kindergartener ties his/her own shoelaces for the first time; when multiplication finally clicks for a second grader; when the computer program gives you everything you always wanted to know; when that art student succeeds in centering the clay on the potter's wheel. Yes, these are prideful moments for all teachers. But they do not feed a family or pay for your additional college classes.

How one views teacher's salaries depends in part on one's own income and his/her expectations of teachers. It is often colored by a conviction that teachers get a year's pay (twelve months) for nine months of work.

This is a myth! The average Iowa teacher puts in as many hours in nine months as a typical year-round worker, and often more. I base my statement on a survey conducted in ten selected locals of Lincolnway Uniserv Unit. I sent 395 surveys, of which 255 were returned. That is 64.5 percent return. (That in itself is significant! A 30 percent return of surveys is considered the norm.)

My simple survey found that the average teacher's workweek is 50-52 hours, with a large majority of teachers working on school-related activities 60+ hours a week.

Let's just use the low figure for computational purposes. The 50-hour figure amounts to 10 hours per class day. Iowa law requires 180 school days. That makes 1,800 hours. Master contracts bind teachers to additional days before and after the start of classes plus inservice days. This usually totals 10 days. At 8 hours per day this adds an additional 80 hours. The grand total of a teacher's work hours is 1,880. Of course, none of the hours include the taking of additional college courses to meet the state-mandated human relations requirement, or securing another special education or reading endorsement because the school says "get it" or "no job," or working on a Mas-

ter's Degree in the summer to move across on the salary schedule. (By the way, several survey respondents said they cannot afford to go back to school or take additional courses.)

Four-week vacations are common for even beginning workers in some professional fields and for many other persons. Eight paid holidays are common. On that basis, a 40 hour-a-week employee works 1,856 hours a year on his "full time" job compared with the teacher's "part time" 1,880 hours!

That 40 hours work week means:

no parent phone calls and conferences in the evening because of working parents;

no checking of papers, preparing tests, just plain preparing to teach, or doing report cards, permanent records, etc.;

no chaperoning a group of debaters 100 miles—leaving at 3 p.m. on Friday and not returning home until midnight Saturday; being the sole person responsible for each one of those "future leaders";

no tutoring of sick students in the hospital or at home;

not being called to the school during vacation to check-in inventory or review bids for supplies or get one's room in order, check that all the worksheets are ready, etc.

With these facts in mind, I would like to review the survey results.

Question 1: checking papers—7 percent spend 3-7 hours or more per week.

Question 2: supervising students, ticket taking, etc.—58 percent spend 1-3 hours per week.

Question 3: committee work—84 percent spend 1-3 hours per week.

Question 4: preparation of room—67 percent spend 1-3 hours per week.

Question 5: record keeping and management systems—78 percent spend 1-3 hours per week.

Each question addresses an area, which taken separately, may not seem like much to a casual observer. However, when all of these are happening week after week, the hours skyrocket!

This is my maiden voyage in surveying opinion and evaluating data. I have learned a great deal. One thing I would change is my question 8 (on out-of-pocket contributions), and I should have known from my own experience. As you can see, teachers subsidize education not only with extra hours of labor but also with dollars. Fifty-eight percent spend more than \$25.00 on various classroom needs: from Kleenex to aquarium supplies; from stickers to laminating of learning games; from buying innovative, enrichment booklets to buying Christmas tree decorations; from buying refreshments for athletes to purchasing food for tasting parties. The list goes on and on. I should have had a much larger dollar amount listed on question 8. Numerous surveys listed such comments as: "this is an understatement," or "way too low." People listed dollar amounts from \$75.00 to \$100.00, \$200.00, even \$500.00 spent on school-related expenditures.

In closing, teachers are a hard-working, concerned, effective group of professionals. We have some of the finest teachers right here in Iowa, as proven by the great achievement scores of Iowa's children. We are a proud people!●

THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR  
THE MENTALLY ILL

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill held their first legislative seminar here in Washington, and I would like to call their efforts to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

The National Alliance is an organization of relatives and friends of people suffering from mental illness. NAMI helps to set up selfhelp and support groups for families with mentally ill members. Its overall aim is to improve the quality of life for the mentally ill—to work for as much normalcy as possible in their lives. The members of NAMI are also actively involved in increasing public awareness of the problems of the mentally ill and in working to remove the stigma that is often attached to mental illness. In a very short time, the members of NAMI throughout the United States have become effective advocates of the rights and interests of the mentally ill. Their presence here in Washington last week demonstrated the human dimension of the problems of mental illness.

NAMI has developed and presented a Federal legislative agenda which will be the focal point of its members' activities at the Federal Government level over the next year. It includes support for additional funding for the National Institute of Mental Health to provide for research and training in the field of mental health. The agenda also calls for a program of demonstration projects within the Community Support Program and Federal incentives for community mental health care for homeless mentally ill persons. In the field of housing, NAMI advocates greater effort by the Federal Government in the task of providing housing for the mentally ill through existing programs such as the section 8 rent subsidy program and the section 202 long-term loan facility.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the members of the National Alliance and its president, Mr. James Howe. In particular, I would like to recognize Dr. Davis Pollack, a resident of Bay Shore and one of my constituents, whose work as chair of the NAMI Government Relations Committee was particularly evident during the legislative conference last week. The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill deserves our support.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION  
OF THE ALTERNATIVE WORK  
SCHEDULE PROGRAM (H.R.  
1534)

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce today legislation which would permanently reauthorize the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-221). For much too long this praiseworthy program has been a mere experiment. Both Federal employees and Federal managers have bestowed the alternative work schedule program with rave reviews.

During the past 3 years, over 325,000 Federal employees in more than 1,500 different occupations have taken part in the Alternative Work Schedule [AWS] Program. The alternative to traditional work hours has benefited not only the employees, but also the Federal Government. The flexibility of time management has permitted employers to tailor working hours to utilize their employees more effectively, as well as to meet the needs of civil servants.

Flexible schedules allow employees, within limits, to vary the times which they report to and depart from work. Compressed schedules permit employees to complete their same hourly requirements in fewer days. AWS allows working parents to structure their work schedules to best take care of their children's needs. Appointments outside of the work environment can be more easily arranged without having to use sick or annual leave. Commuting time to and from work can be drastically reduced. In short, workers have greater control over their work lives.

Mr. Speaker, alternatives to the traditional 40-hour workweek—8 hours a day, 5 days a week—were first introduced in 1978 as a means to improve the efficiency of the Federal bureaucracy and the morale of the Federal workforce. By all available information it was a successful endeavor. In 1982, my former colleague from New York, Geraldine Ferraro, was able to reauthorize the program for another 3 years. On July 23 of this year, the legislation is due to expire. It would be unfortunate if this House would allow the act to lapse.

The Federal employees flexible and compressed work schedules have a proven track record. The statute has increased the hours of service of many Federal agencies, reduced absenteeism, reduced energy consumption, increased operational efficiency, has had a positive effect on employee commut-

ing patterns, and, overall, has improved employee morale.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support my bill which would permanently reauthorize the Alternative Work Schedule Program and contact me should desire to cosponsor the measure.●

THE ARMS CONTROL  
STALEMATE

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I thought my House colleagues might be interested in the following op-ed article from the March 6, 1985, Detroit News entitled "The Arms Control Stalemate."

THE ARMS CONTROL STALEMATE

(By Jim Courter)

A new bipartisan approach to nuclear arms control is making its way into arms control thinking. Centered on the concept of the "defense-protected build-down," this approach seeks to break the arms control stalemate.

It revives an old idea. In 1962 Soviet foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko suggested just such an approach at the UN: Dismantle offensive systems but leave intact a defensive cover to allay fears of any cheating. If President Ronald Reagan can convince the Soviets to return to this idea we could have the makings of an agreement.

Conventional wisdom in the United States has opposed development of nuclear defense systems. They would supposedly be destabilizing: A leakproof system encourages a first strike. The arms race, it is argued, would simply proceed on two tracks.

Partly because this assumption has led to fruitless arms control efforts, it is now being challenged by the left and the right. The central idea, simply, is that the side furthest along in its development of a defensive shield will be in the best position to offer concessions and flexibility in offensive nuclear arms, thus easing the way to successful negotiations.

Two recent books develop variations on this new thesis. From the right is "A Defense That Defends," by journalist Gregory Fossedal and retired Gen. Daniel O. Graham. From the left is "The Abolition," by Jonathan Schell, a freeze movement founder. Their common theme is that the accepted arms control framework aimed at sustaining a perpetual balance of terror is itself a barrier to disarmament.

Currently, the debate is nearly deadlocked between two opposing positions. Republican policy-makers support "Star Wars" as long as there is no nuclear freeze, and liberal Democrats support the freeze but shun any movement toward ballistic missile defense.

Opinion polls, however, indicate support for the Star Wars defensive shield, based on confidence in the potential of 21st century technology. Voters also tell pollsters that they would support a nuclear freeze if this did not give the Soviets an advantage.

The prevailing public sentiment, this suggests, prefers a framework that—by encom-

passing offense and defense—makes negotiation easier.

Wouldn't the freeze movement be thrilled if we could negotiate and agreement with Moscow to dismantle 75 percent of both sides offensive weapons? What's the difference, then, if we were to build a defensive shield capable of 75 percent effectiveness in neutralizing Soviet missiles? If the Soviets had a similar system, each side's deterrent force would exist at much lower levels of destruction, and could be reduced further through negotiation.

Opponents of defensive systems have to face the fact that without them, U.S. presidents must demand almost air-tight verification methods to block Soviet cheating. Arms control talks languish as the Soviets reject on-site inspection. With defense, a president could add a cushion of the much cheaper missile interceptors to offset hidden, unverifiable Soviet missiles.

Defense systems, then, can break the arms control stalemate. Because a survivable deterrent is what counts, a defensive component gives a president leeway in agreeing to offensive build-downs. The security afforded by defensive systems is especially important in the context of deep cuts in offensive weapons, where marginal cheating on low missile limits would take on a greater, potentially destabilizing proportion.

Part of the key is economic. It is so much cheaper for the United States to add marginal interceptors than for the Soviets to add new missiles that the resulting dynamic "could truly make nuclear weapons obsolete," asserts a Brookings Institution report.

In the long term, defense is stabilizing, rendering any buildup for an offensive first strike hopelessly expensive and complicated. If we show the Soviets that we are eager to negotiate an offensive build-down to accompany our defensive buildup, they have no reason to feel threatened by strategic defense.

Is "defense-protected build-down" therefore realistic? Only disarmament will truly remove the nuclear peril. Defense would provide confidence without naive trust. And only then can we ever dream of a world without nuclear missiles. ●

#### EXPOSING THE NEA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the education that our children receive is a crucial issue to all parents. However, our current system has failed adequately to educate the youth in our country. Education has proven to be far inferior to the traditional standards that we had 20 to 30 years ago.

A lot of the blame for this decline can be attributed to the fact that control has been taken away from parents and local communities, where it belongs. While some reforms have recently taken place, we still have a long way to go in bringing our educational system up to par, and returning control to parents and communities.

One organization that has hampered, and has in effect been largely responsible for this loss of control, is

the National Education Association [NEA]. Recently I had the opportunity to read a book by Sally Reed entitled "NEA: Propaganda Front of the Radical Left."

Citing numerous statistics pointing to the academic and moral deterioration of the Nation's public schools, the book exposes the NEA as the major destabilizing factor in American education. The author traces the NEA monopoly over the teaching profession through a series of power grabs and deceptive maneuvers from the 1920's and goes on to show how the organization has wrested control of the schools from parents in order to further its own political interests. Armed with numerous passages from NEA's own publications, the book emphasizes the union's radical and extremist political positions, its arrogance toward the public, its contempt for parents and their rights, its uninterest in educational excellence, its deceptiveness of purpose, and, most importantly, its educational malpractice as purveyors of psychologically abusive materials and unsound teaching methodologies in the classroom.

The author also shows how the NEA, using loopholes in the law, is successfully removing traditional Judeo-Christian religious values from the education process and substitution of its own religious teaching, humanism, in their place. The book goes on to describe legal methods whereby parents and communities might regain control of the educational institutions, including eschewing Federal funds, asserting existing rights, carefully checking school materials, and creating educational enterprise zones.

I strongly recommend that this book be read by everyone who wishes to improve our current system of education. A copy may be obtained from Sally Reed, the executive director of the National Council for Better Education in Washington, DC. ●

#### TRAGEDIES OF MEDICAL POLICIES

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, before the Reagan administration or this Congress seeks to solve the immediate concern of huge budget deficits by further cutting the health care now available to indigents, each should recognize the seriousness of the problem today, and the likely continuation of such problems if the policy is pursued further. Whereas a human life was once a priceless sanctity, it now seems to be viewed in dollars and cents. This is not a demagogic, speculative or alarmist view. More and more each

day it is becoming a reality for most financially disadvantaged citizens when they are in need of emergency health care.

The source of such medical conduct is probably most related to the recent cuts in the Medicare Program—which is the largest source of income for most general hospitals. While such budgetary cuts may provide the Federal Government with some immediate financial relief, one has to wonder, however, whether the benefits of this policy have been worth the costs.

Subsequently, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 8, 1985. The article recounts numerous documented examples where tragedy resulted from the difficulty experienced by health care officials in providing emergency, professional health care to indigents. While such examples are shocking to the moral conscious, what is most discouraging perhaps, is that they vividly represent the lackadaisical attitude toward human dignity which has increasingly begun to pervade this country. Such an attitude can only be reversed by revealing the tragic consequences of policy decisions.

The following article discusses the need, and the means available, to change such an attitude in policy:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 8, 1985]

#### HOSPITALS IN COST SQUEEZE "DUMP" MORE PATIENTS WHO CAN'T PAY BILLS

A 32-year-old accident victim lies unconscious in a Florida hospital that has no neurosurgeon available. But two larger hospitals with neurosurgeons refuse to accept him upon learning there is no guarantee his bill will be paid.

A pediatrician in a Rock Hill, S.C., hospital wants to transfer a comatose three-year-old girl to a better-equipped urban medical center. But her family has no health insurance, and two hospitals refuse to take her. A hospital 100 miles away finally accepts her.

These are examples of a controversial practice called "dumping," wherein hospitals avoid admitting or keeping poor or uninsured patients by sending them to hospitals willing to bear the costs.

The practice isn't new but has surged recently, largely as a result of cuts in Medicaid and Medicare support to individuals and health-care institutions. "The number of hospitals willing to provide free care is small and dwindling, but the number of patients who are uninsured is rising," says Judith Feder, an economist with Georgetown University's Center for Health Policy.

Dumping isn't illegal or even unethical; hospitals face fines, loss of license, civil damages or other penalties only if patients fail to get needed care.

#### HEART ATTACKS AND BROKEN BONES

But many doctors contend that the practice inevitably contributes to less-than-optimal care for some patients. Last year several Harvard Medical School doctors published an analysis of medical records of 103 patients transferred from private hospitals to tax-supported Highland General Hospital in

Oakland, Calif. In 33 cases they concluded that the transfer jeopardized the patient. For example, they found that heart-attack and stroke patients were transferred before being stabilized, and that patients with broken bones weren't given antibiotics before being dumped. In one private hospital, two neurosurgeons refused to see a 36-year-old uninsured man who had received head injuries in a fight. He went into a coma before being transferred to Highland, where doctors discovered he had a fractured skull. The man died without regaining consciousness.

The study concluded that the transfers appeared to have been for economic rather than medical reasons because Highland's care wasn't necessarily better than that of the private hospitals. "What we found were that the transfers were a form of medical abuse," says David U. Himmelstein, head of the Harvard project.

That view gets support from Arnold Relman, editor of the influential *New England Journal of Medicine* in a recent editorial: "As economic pressures on hospitals grow and hospital managers are encouraged or forced to act like businessmen concerned primarily with profit margins, more and more patients will be denied access to urgently needed care simply because they can't pay for it."

Evidence is mounting that dumping is on the rise. In Dallas, for example, indigent patients are transferred from private hospitals to tax-supported Parkland Memorial Hospital at the rate of 200 a month, nearly three times the 1983 rate.

Last year, Cook County Hospital in Chicago admitted 6,000 emergency patients transferred from private hospitals. That's five times as many transfers as four years ago, says Gordon Schiff, Cook County Hospital physician who co-authored a recent study of dumping there. Private institutions often patch up an indigent emergency patient just enough to survive the ride to Cook County, says Dr. Schiff. "They treat 'em, stabilize 'em and dump 'em."

Emergency patients aren't the only people who get dumped. "In recent months we've been seeing more and more patients with simple problems who are brought here because it would take the other hospital 15 or 20 minutes to treat the problem and they wouldn't get paid for it," says Robert Rothstein, chairman of the emergency department at Los Angeles County-Harbor UCLA Medical Center.

Dumping's resurgence is largely a result of financial problems facing Medicare and Medicaid; the two insurance programs enacted 20 years ago to stop the dumping of the elderly and poor into charity wards and public hospitals where they received second-class care.

#### THE MEDICAID SQUEEZE

Several years ago, many states, alarmed at the cost of their share of Medicaid, began to cut the near-poor from the program, restrict benefits to those who remained on the rolls and reduce payments to hospitals. For awhile, hospitals made up losses from non-paying patients and Medicaid patients by increasing charges to Medicare, Blue Cross and privately insured patients.

But early last year, the Medicare program—the biggest source of income for most general hospitals—began curtailing hospital payments to halt skyrocketing costs. Private hospitals say they continue to provide free care equal to 4% to 6% of their costs but add that Medicare and Medicaid cuts force

new limits on how many nonpaying patients they can accept.

"We just can't handle everyone who comes in; we'd go broke," says John Easton, a spokesman for the University of Chicago hospitals.

Most hospitals insist that they never turn patients with serious or life-threatening conditions away from the emergency room. But doctors say dumping can be subtle, making it difficult to distinguish the case of a patient transferred for economic reasons from the case of one transferred for legitimate medical reasons.

Take, for example, the case of Costica Cretu, a 32-year-old Rumanian refugee who worked as a dishwasher in Key West, Fla. Mr. Cretu received head injuries when he was struck by a car last August. He was taken to private Florida Keys Memorial Hospital, where he was put on a life-support system. Friends told the hospital Mr. Cretu probably couldn't pay his bill. Nor would the county guarantee payment, say state officials who investigated the case. It hasn't any funds for indigent care.

#### NO GUARANTEED PAYMENT

Florida Keys, which has no neurosurgeon, unsuccessfully tried transferring Mr. Cretu to two other hospitals. Tax-supported Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami says it refused the transfer because it considered Mr. Cretu to be "brain dead." A spokesman for South Miami Hospital, a private institution, says the hospital thought it would be unwieldy to transfer Mr. Cretu by helicopter. Moreover, he added: "Apparently there wasn't any way to be reimbursed." But Lee Dykes, a state health-department investigator, says "The problem at both hospitals was lack of guaranteed payment." Mr. Cretu died of brain injuries three days after the accident.

Hal Anderson, the Rock Hill, S.C., pediatrician, found it difficult last July to transfer three-year-old Shameka McMullen from Piedmont Medical Center to a better-equipped urban hospital. A comatose Miss McMullen was admitted to Piedmont after suffering a stroke and brain damage following the onset of meningitis. Piedmont, a for-profit hospital owned by American Medical International, has no intensive-care unit. Because no neurosurgeon was available there, Dr. Anderson appealed to Richland Memorial Hospital in Columbia, S.C., 77 miles away. Richland refused to accept the girl.

Judy Cotchett Smith, a Richland spokeswoman, says the hospital admits patients with life-threatening illnesses to its emergency room regardless of ability to pay. But Miss McMullen, whose family had no insurance, was in the care of a hospital in another county. Ms. Smith says Richland doesn't accept transfers of indigent patients from outside the county unless the transferring hospital agrees to pay the bill, but Piedmont wouldn't guarantee payment. A Piedmont spokeswoman says Piedmont provided \$2.5 million worth of free care for indigent patients last year and can't afford to pay expenses for patients transferred to other hospitals.

#### A MISTAKE IN COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Anderson then tried transferring Miss McMullen to Charlotte Memorial Hospital, 25 miles across the state line in Charlotte, N.C. Al Pruitt, a Charlotte spokesman, describes that hospital's refusal to accept her as "a mistake in communications during a late-night telephone conversation." He says the hospital physician who spoke with Dr.

Anderson wasn't a regular member of the emergency staff and was unaware that the hospital would accept acutely ill patients from another state. But Mr. Pruitt says that Charlotte hospitals are reluctant to accept indigent patients from South Carolina because that state's Medicaid program won't pay for treatment outside South Carolina.

Three hours after Dr. Anderson began trying to transfer Miss McMullen, North Carolina Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem, 100 miles away, agreed to accept her. But specialists there could do little for her. Two months later the comatose child was released to her mother. She died early last month. Dr. Anderson says the delay in transferring her probably didn't affect the outcome, but he considers her case a tragic example of the difficulty getting care for indigents.

Maria and Charles Musgrave of Houston say they experienced dumping about 18 months ago when Mrs. Musgrave was admitted to Hermann Hospital in the early stages of labor to have her baby. The Musgraves had previously paid a \$250 deposit on their \$1,500 bill. After an overnight stay, tests revealed she should deliver by Caesarean section. But the Musgraves say the hospital asked for "cash up front" for the \$4,000 operation upon learning the couple didn't have health insurance. The Musgraves say they offered to pay in installments but the hospital told Mrs. Musgrave to go to the county hospital. Mr. Musgrave drove his wife, who was already contracting, to Jefferson Davis Hospital where their son was born six hours later.

Hermann Hospital officials cite patient confidentiality in declining to discuss the case, a spokesman says childbirth is considered an elective procedure requiring proof of ability to pay before admission.

Some states are acting to curb dumping's abuses. Last year Florida began taxing private hospitals at a rate of 1% of their revenues to fund a pool to pay bills of uninsured low-income patients. Kentucky business and health leaders formed a foundation to persuade doctors and hospitals to volunteer free care for poor patients not covered by health-care plans. A telephone hotline service begun in January arranged free care for almost 12,000 patients in its first six weeks.

And, according to George Washington University's Intergovernmental Health Policy Project, 22 state legislatures are considering programs to alleviate dumping. "Some are looking to expand their Medicaid eligibility," says research associate Randy Desonia. "Some of these are the same states that restricted eligibility in recent years." ●

#### PROF. GEORGE S. BLAIR RECOGNIZED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

#### HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with the Western Political Science Association in honoring Dr. George S. Blair this month for his life achievements. Dr. Blair is one of California's and indeed the Nation's outstanding educators. He will be formally honored this month when the

Western Political Science Association holds its annual meeting in Las Vegas, NV.

I believe Dr. Blair is going to be pleasantly surprised when he finds that his colleagues will be honoring him not simply with words, but with deeds as well. Those who know the devotion Professor Blair has had throughout his adult life to excellence in education have gotten together to create the George S. Blair fellowship. That fellowship will support outstanding graduate students at Claremont Graduate School, the fine California institution to which Dr. Blair has given so much.

In my opinion, our top educators deserve to be recognized as national heroes. They guide and develop the minds that make our Nation strong, humane, and ingenious. Dr. Blair is one of these heroes. After earning his bachelor and M.S. degrees at Kansas State Teachers College, Dr. Blair went on to Northwestern for his Ph.D., which he received in 1951.

He developed his teaching and research skills at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, and the University of Pennsylvania. But I think it's safest to say that California and Claremont Graduate School won his heart. He joined Claremont's faculty in 1960, and is now in his 25th year of service there. He became a full professor in Claremont's School of Government in 1964. He was held in such esteem by his colleagues that he became chairman of the Graduate Faculty in Government in 1967, and has served in that capacity to the present day. A person has to be held in the highest regard by those who serve under him to have the opportunity to hold the top position for 13 years.

But teaching has always been a priority with Dr. Blair, and I suspect that he values the academic honor of holding the Elisabeth Helm Rosecrans Chair of Social Science in highest regard. For his holding of that Chair is in acknowledgment by his colleagues of his achievements in teaching and research.

I count it a privilege to be able to inform my colleagues in the House of Representatives about one who has contributed so much to our understanding of ourselves and our political practices. It is with pride that I tell you California is the home of Dr. George S. Blair, an outstanding educator, an American hero. ●

## ARMS CONTROL AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET: A LOOK AT CONGRESSIONAL DECISION-MAKING

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues the remarks I gave to the Congressional Quarterly Conference on "Arms Control and the Defense Budget: A Look at Congressional Decisionmaking" which I hope you will find of interest:

I'm pleased to be here to deliver a few remarks on the relationship between arms control, Congress and the defense budget.

Our topic is one of the most interesting—and most sensitive—in the defense policy debate. It goes straight to the heart of the prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches in defense and foreign policy.

My view is that if Congress is to make budget decisions on the basis of arms control considerations, it should only do so with extreme caution. The institution of Congress is not well designed to integrate ongoing diplomatic negotiations with the national defense funding responsibilities assigned to it in the Constitution.

The founding fathers designed our government in a way that keeps Congress out of the formulation of foreign policy. This was a wise decision, for it recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of Congress and the Executive, and assigns their duties accordingly. Congress, we know from the Federalist papers, is designed to be a turbulent, competitive arena which seeks to balance the nation's many interests through a process of debate and compromise. This works reasonably well in domestic policy, where every day we see the brokering and compromise of interests and viewpoints in the search for national policies which serve the common good.

But this natural brokering process, which is a legislature's strength in domestic policy, is the very source of its weakness as an actor in foreign policy and diplomatic negotiations. Diplomacy requires secrecy, a long-range strategy, the steady pursuit of this strategy, and the presentation of a single, unified American position to foreign governments. One doesn't have to observe Congress for very long to see that it is not optimally suited to these requirements.

Does this mean that Congress should pay no attention to the arms control process? Decidedly not. Since Congress plays a role in the approval and implementation of treaties, Congress should follow negotiations with great interest. The appointment of congressional observers to the Geneva Arms Reduction Talks recognized this necessity.

The problem with Congress starts when we get to the defense budget. At first glance, there seems to be nothing inherently wrong with tailoring the defense budget to arms control negotiations. But to cut or alter military programs due to the mere existence of arms talks and the possibility of an agreement is essentially to deny that we have a strategic vision—that is, an array of interests, a perception of the threat to those interests, and idea of how to protect those interests. This vision, and the will of a unified U.S. government to act on it is, after

all, the greatest incentive that the Soviets have to negotiate. When Congress undercuts it, it undercuts the chances for arms control.

Last year's House action on the MX missile gives the best example of a well-intended, but unhealthy Congressional intrusion into the arms control process. The House position last May, you will remember, was as follows: After President Reagan requested money for 40 MX missiles, and after the House Armed Services Committee authorized funding for 30, the full House authorized 15 missiles. But this funding was to be locked up for the first six months of the fiscal year, and it could only be released if the Soviets refused to return to the arms talks that they had abandoned in 1983. If they returned, the money remained locked up.

The authors of this arrangement explained that they were seeking leverage: leverage over the President, by cutting his MX request, and leverage over the Soviets, by offering them a reward for returning to the arms talks. Congress was thus poised to become a third actor in the negotiating process. Instead of making an up-or-down decision on the military utility of the MX missile, the House was bargaining with the Soviets, and seeking to give Moscow what would have amounted to a measure of control over the schedule of the MX program.

Internal divisions such as this, between the branches of the U.S. Government, were one of the problems the founding fathers sought to avoid when they assigned foreign policy duties to the Executive. Alexander Hamilton explained why the House in particular was ill-suited to the formation of international policy.

He said: "Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views . . . decision, secrecy and dispatch are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous" (as the House of Representatives).

Hamilton was right. Congress is too diverse and too volatile a body to be engaged in the actual operations of foreign policy. In today's context of arms control and the defense budget, this is especially true.

In addition, there's the problem of unilateralism. When Congress tries to help arms control by slowing down programs such as MX or ASAT in the name of stability or verifiability, it can only take unilateral actions. Congress lacks the leverage to force Soviet concessions. Arkady Shevchenko, the Soviet defector, explained this very clearly to the Armed Services Committee just last week. He told us that when Congress makes unilateral concessions in the hope of enticing the Soviets into making reciprocal cuts—an approach he called "wrong and even dangerous"—the Soviets only escalate their demands.

Shevchenko teaches us a clear lesson: Neither arms control nor national security will be served if Congress insists on negotiating with the President while the President is negotiating with the Soviets. Nor is it helpful for Congress to subject military programs to arms control criteria and to legislative compromises which are more appropriate to public works or agriculture programs than to defense.

Today, some argue that the Soviets have come back to the table to negotiate seriously over the Strategic Defense Initiative. But it's equally plausible to argue that, based on previous congressional actions, they came back to the table for two reasons:

First, to give the appearance to negotiating with the President, and

Second, to actually negotiate with the Congress, by publicly hinting at the offensive force cuts they will offer if SDI is stopped, in the hope that Congress will stop the SDI for them.

It's hard to say at this early stage whether this guess will prove correct. But it's also hard to say, given the previous behavior of Congress, that it wouldn't be rational for the Soviets to adopt this strategy.

To sum up, I believe that arms negotiations should affect the defense budget only when agreements have been reached and approved. For Congress to do otherwise will only complicate the already formidable tasks our negotiators face in Geneva.

This year's defense authorization debate is about to heat up, and I can hardly be optimistic that my views or methodology will prevail. Congress is full of strong personalities, with strong views on all subjects. But Congress should try to exercise some self-restraint, and realize that its effort to chart an independent course on arms control unintentionally helps the Soviet negotiating strategy, which is to divide the President, the public, the Congress and our allies to the greatest extent possible.

Either the MX is militarily necessary, or it is not. Either SDI is worth pursuing for reasons of security, stability and deterrence, or it is not. Congress should decide these questions on military criteria, period, and leave the task of negotiating to the Executive Branch, where it belongs.●

#### A NEW HISTORY OF MUHLENBERG COUNTY, KY

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate one of my constituents, Paul Camplin of Greenville, Muhlenberg County, KY, for his newly published book, "A New History of Muhlenberg County."

Indeed, Paul Camplin is a meticulous researcher and an entertaining writer. Camplin, having worked on the book for 3 years, has written a most useful and comprehensive publication and given Muhlenberg County's history from 1912 onward. In fact, it is the most extensive book on Muhlenberg County, KY to be produced in more than 72 years.

I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent article by Carolyn Hillard of the Leader News in Greenville, KY, entitled "Paul Camplin's New Muhlenberg History." The article about Paul Camplin and his book follows:

[From, the Greenville, KY, Leader News]  
PAUL CAMPLIN'S NEW MUHLENBERG HISTORY  
(By Carolyn Hillard)

GREENVILLE.—Supporting his reputation as a meticulous researcher and entertaining writer, Greenville author Paul Camplin has produced a real treasure trove of information about Muhlenberg County in his book "A New History of Muhlenberg County."

"If you want to know Muhlenberg County," a Nashville reviewer wrote, "then this book is a must. This is a practical, well-documented and well-written book by an author who knows his subject well."

A history of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky primarily from 1912 onward, the book contains hundreds of family names and is full indexed in large, readable type. Its visual appeal is enhanced by a generous scattering of rare photos, 230 illustrations in all. Most have not been published before and come from prized family photo collections.

"I'd say it's an accurate account of more recent generations that will interest readers of all ages," the author described recently.

In the preface to his new book, Camplin expands on that simple description. "... It has been a sincere and dedicated attempt to record the story of our county towns, villages and crossroads, mainly to document those who settled each locale and when. The way the places got their names, and in some cases various names. The first and succeeding postmasters and a list of the people who do, and have lived there."

The book should be of particular interest to historians, genealogists, and former and present residents of the communities which Camplin spotlights. In total, the 304 page book encompasses 61 chapters; 25 chapters on the origins of communities.

In his easy, readable writing style, Camplin relates the origin of coal mining towns such as Beech Creek, Graham and Powderly and traces the birth and eventual demise of Paradise, a mining community that faded into non-existence when the coal played-out.

Camplin writes about men like William W. (Billy) Bridges, who once "parlayed hard work, good looks, and fine manners into owning the town of Drakesboro." And bringing it up to the present, the book includes a good smattering of current history as well.

There are lists of former county officials, oil activity records in Muhlenberg from 1960 to 1963, Muhlenberg coal production and Muhlenberg Revolutionary War soldiers, among other fascinating facts.

Not many people know, Camplin said, that Muhlenberg County contains one of the nation's coal, oil and gas centers of production. Paying homage to the effect that the coal and oil industries continue to have on the county, Camplin has included five chapters on the two industries.

Camplin said he started writing about the history of Muhlenberg County because there were stories he felt ought to be told and set down in print before they were forgotten.

"The information was there, but with a few more generations passing, it would have been a lost history," he explained. "I really did this mainly as a journal to pass on to future generations."

The three years he's spent in gathering and compiling the history have been purely a labor of love, Camplin said. "It's been minutely researched. You have to love to do this to take it on," he admitted, "I spend my waking hours writing, but that's what I love."

As meticulous in his approach to production as he is in writing, Camplin did all the layout, positioning and placing the type and photos himself.

Earlier this year Camplin formed his own private publishing company, Caney Station Books. He chose that name for his fledgling company he said, because the first graveyard in the county, at Caney Station, hap-

pens to be located just behind his home and office. The historical connection seemed appropriate.

Camplin's history, which is planned as the first in a series, is being printed by Williams Printing Company of Nashville. It is being listed in more than a half dozen of the nation's book listing and catalog services.

With years of background in the printed media, Camplin can be considered something of a publishing expert, on everything from writing to selecting type styles and paper stock. He would be willing to talk to other persons with manuscripts that might make good books, he said.

As might be expected, Camplin is a member of various historical organizations, including the Filson Club, the Kentucky Historical Society and the Muhlenberg County Art and Historical Society. He is a past president of the latter group.

A native of Muhlenberg County, Camplin left here at the age of 17 and served in the navy during World War II, continuing as a submarine officer for 13 years before retiring.

It was while in the navy that he got some training in journalism and started to realize the importance of learning more about the world. "I guess I've studied almost constantly for 20 years... I've tried to be a serious student of just about everything," Camplin said.

Having traveled extensively himself, Camplin said he would urge everyone to visit other countries and experience a different culture if they can because "It gives a dimension to things that you can't acquire any other way."

His advise to beginning writers is simple. Write about what you know. "The best writing is done by people who get pleasure from doing it," he added, "And it doesn't matter whether what they do is important or useful to anyone else."

Camplin worked for the Evansville Courier-Press as a photographer/feature writer for a while after retiring from the navy, moving on to become a journalist with the Kentucky Department of Public Information.

During his years at that job he produced five softbound books for the state, including histories on forestry, surface mining, soil and river systems and ecology-beautification in the state. The history of surface mining is still the only history available on the subject.

"A New History of Muhlenberg County" is Camplin's first book in a hardbound edition.

"I could never express enough thanks to people who've helped me with information and provided me the loan of photos. In just about all instances when I've asked they've come through every time." Camplin said. "Doing something like this is like a big jigsaw puzzle. You have to piece it together, and you keep hunting the pieces and working until you do it."

"I hope that 50 years from now people will still be reading it." Camplin said. Much the same as people still refer to Rother's History of Muhlenberg County, the last county history published 72 years ago.●

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE: PREPARING FOR TOMORROW

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share the following article from the New York Times, describing the President's strategic defense initiative [SDI], with my colleagues in the Congress. Mr. Ken Adelman, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, presents some of the most cogent arguments that I have seen as to why our Nation and the world need SDI. It is a bold new step aimed at eventually eliminating the threat posed by nuclear armed ballistic missiles. SDI is a program of vigorous research focused on advanced defensive technologies with the aim of finding ways to provide a better basis for deterring aggression, strengthening stability, and increasing the security of the United States and our allies.

Since the advent of nuclear weapons, every President has sought to minimize the risk of nuclear destruction by maintaining effective forces to deter aggression and by pursuing complementary arms control agreements. For 40 years, we and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war while protecting Western security.

Because of the awesome destructive potential of nuclear weapons, however, we must seek another means of deterring war. From a military and moral point of view, it is necessary. There has to be a better way to strengthen peace and stability. There must be a way to move away from the strategy of massive nuclear retaliation. Why not move toward greater reliance on defensive systems which threaten no one? SDI is also nonnuclear defense. As such, it would help to move the world away from the menace of nuclear weapons.

With these general observations in mind, I suggest that my colleagues in the House read this enlightening article.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1985]

TOWARD A DEFENSE STRATEGY

(By Kenneth L. Adelman)

Washington.—The starting point for any rational discourse on the Strategic Defense Initiative—and many discourses on it have not been rational—is a large dose of modesty at predicting what science can offer in the future. How many times in our history has human ingenuity overcome human expectations and even expert predictions?

Thomas Edison, for example, forecast: "Fooling around with alternating currents is just a waste of time. Nobody will use it, ever. It's too dangerous." This—and countless other examples—should be enough to rise questions about the so-called "experts" who say a strategic defense can never work.

Why have we embarked on strategic defense research? Nuclear deterrence has

worked, preventing both conventional and nuclear war for some 40 years. For the past few decades, however, its success has hinged on mutual assured destruction—the threat, in effect, to inflict unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union in retaliation for aggression.

Such a dreadful "balance of terror" has naturally come into question, then under attack, from people all across the ideological spectrum. Surely, if possible the President should have options—not just the one button. If another button—to destroy incoming nuclear weapons—might be feasible, shouldn't we look into that possibility?

Beyond this, there are three reasons to move toward a defensive strategy.

First, defensive technology has progressed markedly over the past decade or so. Though we do not know exactly what the future holds, we do know that today's research—in computers, sensors, radars, lasers and high-energy particle beams—holds considerable promise.

To take a relatively simple example: for many years, it has been assumed that defense against ballistic missiles was not cost-effective. No matter how much defense one side deploys, it is still cheaper for the other side to overwhelm those defenses with decoys or more offensive systems. But that equation, and others may change with new technologies. If so, a strategic defense could be a real incentive to deep reductions in offensive nuclear systems.

It may be true that no strategic defense will ever be 100 percent effective. Yet we can surmise even now that even less than a leak-proof defense—less than a perfect defense—could reduce the risk of war. It could markedly increase a potential attacker's uncertainty about the likelihood that it would be successful—and that, after all, is the essence of deterrence.

A less than perfect defense could also hold out hope against an unauthorized or unintended nuclear attack. Today, a President would have to choose between accepting the destruction of a city or two or retaliation in kind, or both. It would not be a desirable alternative.

A second factor is the ethical dimension. Surely, if we find that some defensive systems can reduce the risk of war, then morality should drive us hard in that direction. Why have more than 1,000 American clergymen endorsed strategic defense research? They do not miss the point—often missed by others—that it would be a non-nuclear defense. It is part of an effort to move the world away from nuclear weapons.

Finally, strategic defense research is what the experts call a "prudent hedge" against the Russians' active defensive programs and research—programs that may be leading Moscow to break its commitment to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

PRACTICAL AND ETHICAL REASONS

The Russians have been conducting a vigorous research program for some years now. They long ago constructed the one anti-ballistic missile defense, around Moscow, permitted them under the treaty, but other activities now suggest that they may be moving toward a nationwide antiballistic missile capability—a violation of the letter and the whole thrust of the accord. Moscow has an extensive air defense program and is continuing vigorous research on lasers and neutron particle beams. Overall, the Soviet Union spends some 10 times more than the United States on defensive programs. Even more startling, in the years since the signing of the treaty, the Russians have spent

roughly as much on strategic defense as on strategic offensive forces.

In this regard, it is useful to remind ourselves that our strategic defense research efforts are fully consistent with our treaty obligations, particularly the ABM treaty. Research on defensive systems is not only permitted under this accord but was actively advocated when we entered into it in 1972. Indeed active research programs on antiballistic missile technology have been supported by every President since, though not with the same emphasis as, President Reagan.

To me, the main threat to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty lies elsewhere. The treaty was founded on an assumption that limits on defensive systems would be followed by limits on offensive systems. This assumption has not been borne out—largely because Moscow has been unwilling to agree to deep reductions.

One of our major objectives in the approaching arms control negotiations will be to go "back to basics" in looking at the relationship between offensive and defensive forces.

Above all, we must scrupulously guard against a vicious cycle in which defensive efforts spur the other side on to more offensive efforts. That snowball effect would undercut stability and weaken deterrence.

We envision the future of arms control in three phases. During the first phase, deterrence will continue to rest almost exclusively on offensive nuclear retaliatory capabilities—but greatly reduced levels of nuclear forces. This period could last 10 or 15 years, or longer, depending largely on strategic defense research. During the second phase, of indefinite duration, we would begin to move toward an ever-greater reliance on defense. The last period would bring the complete elimination of nuclear arms.

This evolution will depend critically on cooperation by Washington, in consultation with its key allies, and Moscow. This has begun and will restart in Geneva on Tuesday.

Despite the profound differences between East and West, there is a shared opinion that we have to get on with reducing—and eventually eliminating—the nuclear threat. Getting back to basics, back to the offense-defense relationship, may be just the prescription for overcoming the impasse in arms control and paving the way for a far safer future.●

DRESDEN BOMBINGS

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching the 40th anniversary of the conclusion of World War II.

During the course of the war, thousands of innocent people fell victim to the brutal realities of global conflict. One particular city which suffered perhaps the greatest death toll during the war was Dresden.

Frank Watra, a resident of my district and a former operative in American intelligence, has written an article on the bombing of Dresden and de-

scribes how the Soviet Union downplayed the death total in order to diminish the perceived impact of the Allied war forces.

I would urge my colleagues to read Mr. Watra's article in memory of the thousands of innocent victims who perished at Dresden 40 years ago.

The article is as follows:

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT  
(By Frank Watra)

The New York Times political columnist, Flora Lewis, recently discussed travel in a piece on the city of Dresden, quoting nameless authorities as her source for reporting the wartime Dresden bombing fatalities as being "35,000."

Those Dresden casualty figures jumped off the page at me. I presumed any literate person, regardless of sensitivity or prejudice, let alone a seasoned reporter or reviewing editor, knew that the allied fire-bombing of Dresden on Feb. 13 and 14, 1945 was considered to be one of the greatest single acts of carnage perpetrated through air raids during World War II.

Based on my recollection of an estimated 135,000 killed, I assumed Ms. Lewis' column simply might have been guilty of a typographical error. Further inquiry and research proved this not to be the answer. To my surprise, however, the four encyclopedias I checked carried no factual data on the Dresden bombing other than referring to the "terrible" or "awful bombings" of World War II.

I finally located an account I had read many years ago, "The Destruction of Dresden," by the British writer, David Irving, and re-read it with mixed feelings. The enormity of the raid was so awesome it has to rank as one of the most egregious accounts of man's inhumanity to man. The carnage was of the magnitude that defied precise identification or death count. Post-war Allied analysis concluded that the Dresden fatalities could be "conservatively estimated" at 135,000.

Mr. Irving stated that Dresden had a population of 600,000, plus an estimated 300,000 to 400,000 Eastern refugees fleeing from the onslaught of the Russian army. Dresden was considered to be a safe, "open" city with little military or industrial value—a magnet at the war's end for the refugees who unknowingly crowded in and around the railroad terminus, the subsequent bombing's prime target.

A captured, high-level secret document in Berlin has made reference to the Dresden "Police President Report," which stated: "Up to March 20, 1945, altogether 202,040 bodies, primarily woman and children, were recovered. It is expected that the final death-toll will exceed 250,000 . . ." Neither the police president (who committed suicide) or report survived the end of the war.

Comparison is made to other historical air raids: Hiroshima—71,379 deaths and the massive March 9-10, 1945 firebombing of Tokyo, 83,793 deaths.

Presumably, most of the Dresden dead were the homeless and nameless refugees. Many were from the Baltic states, Ukraine and Poland. There were also a significant number of forced laborers and Allied prisoners, including Americans.

I continued to read and do research, not so much in sympathy but rather for the facts. After all, the Germans and Japanese were our wartime enemies and guilty of mass terrorism. Representatives of my family, and relatives, fought and suffered

on both fronts. Nevertheless, I finally found the source for Ms. Lewis' figures: The Russians "liberated" Dresden and completely dissolved what little was left of a civil administration, one of whose thankless and impossible tasks was the continuing count and identification of the dead.

To quote David Irving, ". . . the Soviet occupation authorities, true to their insistence that the Allied air forces were not an effective weapon of war, refused to accept the conservative estimate of 135,000 dead, calmly struck off the first digit."

In short, the Soviets who manipulated wartime casualties, one way or another, for their own propaganda purposes simply re-wrote history. Did you know, for example, upon the completion of World War II, the Russians only admitted to 6 million wartime Russian dead? They have gradually upped this figure to a current 20 million. I have always estimated 30 million. Harrison Salisbury of The New York Times recently opined that it's more like 40 million.

In short, Flora Lewis, knowingly or unknowingly, was used (or duped) by Soviet historical "dis-information." In turn, The Times editors were either asleep or accepted the Soviet figures.

One expects more from a great newspaper.

Thank you Mr. Speaker. ●

TRIBUTE TO DOWNEY MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE LEON EMERSON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Judge Leon Emerson of Downey, CA, who is retiring this year from the Downey Municipal Court.

Judge Emerson has served the city of Downey as a municipal court judge for nearly a quarter of a century. He left private practice in 1961 to assume the bench, and has served in that capacity since then in the finest tradition of the law.

After graduating from Allen High School, Judge Emerson attended Compton College and Loyola University, and received his law degree from Southwestern University College of Law. He established a private practice in 1952, which he gave up in 1961 to begin his distinguished career in the municipal court.

However, the judge's contributions to his community have hardly been limited to weighing the scales of justice. He is a former president of the Downey Chamber of Commerce, a life member of the Kiwanis Club, a scoutmaster for 7 years, and founder of the Downey Counseling Center. He is also a former board member of the American Judges Association and has lectured at numerous universities, including UCLA and California State University at Long Beach.

As distinguished as his career has been, his greatest contribution to his

community may be his extensive work in combating alcohol and drug abuse. He is a member of the Los Angeles County Commission on Alcoholism; the California State Bar Association, Committee on Alcohol Abuse; and he is a consultant to the National Center for Alcoholism Education.

His concern for victims of alcoholism and drug addiction and their families led him to write several newspaper and magazine articles on the subject. Downey and the entire Los Angeles area have benefited immeasurably from his tireless efforts and expertise.

Judge Emerson is a civic leader in the truest sense of the word; he has been named "Man of the Year" by organizations too numerous to list here. My wife Lee joins me in wishing Judge Leon Emerson a happy and fulfilling retirement, and him and his wife Lee and their children—Donald, David, Julia, Randy, and Darryl—all the best in the years ahead. ●

FRANCIS B. LACHOWICZ:  
FATHER, FRIEND, AND SHEPHERD

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 14, more than 550 members of St. Denis' Church in Versailles, PA, will join in commemorating the 25th anniversary into the priesthood of a man who has become their father, friend, and shepherd—that Very Reverend Francis B. Lachowicz.

Father Lachowicz has served St. Denis, and its mission, St. Patrick's in Alpsville, PA, since February 1977. Under his leadership, both parishes has prospered. In addition to his church duties, Father Lachowicz has initiated many programs and projects within the parishes and is an active participant in civic functions.

Through his efforts, substantial renovations have been made at St. Denis' Church as well as its school, rectory, social center, et cetera. He has established and revised several parish organizations, introduced special ministers of the Most Holy Eucharist, implemented the First Spiritual Parish Renewal and vigorously increased church activities which led to the elimination of the parish debt.

These accomplishments are indicative of a quality Father Lachowicz developed early in life—a love of hard work. As a student and later as a seminarian, he served as a newsboy, laborer, supermarket clerk, lifeguard, counselor and swim instructor for the blind at Camp Fatima in Butler, PA.

Father Lachowicz was born March 29, 1934, in McKees Rocks, PA, a son of the late Frank and Nora Schwierr

and the youngest of 10 children. He attended S.S. Cyril and Methodius Elementary School there but was graduated from St. Mary's High School in Orchard Lake, MI, and was valedictorian of his class.

He entered the seminary at St. Charles in Philadelphia in September 1952, and worked during the summers of 1958 and 1959 as a deacon at Nativity Church in Broughton, PA, and St. Victor's in Baird, PA. Following his ordination on March 25, 1960, Father Lachowicz was assigned as assistant pastor to St. Wendelin's in Carrick, PA.

He later served in the capacity at St. Adalbert's (1964-68) and St. Josaphat's (1968-72) on Pittsburgh's South Side. In 1972 he was assigned as assistant pastor at St. Joseph's in Coraopolis and St. Martha's in Groveton where he remained until assuming the pastorate of St. Denis in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, Father Lachowicz is the recipient of many honors and awards: Eagle Scout, honorary police captain, Knights of Columbus, the American Red Cross Swim and First Aid Program, and dean of the South Central Allegheny Deanery of the Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh 1983.

On behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, I extend formal congratulations to Father Lachowicz on this occasion and am honored to join the parishioners of St. Denis in honoring the man they know as "pastor, father, friend and shepherd."●

#### THE COMPASSIONATE PAIN RELIEF ACT

**HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it was 6 months ago today that the House considered the Compassionate Pain Relief Act to provide for pain relief for those who are dying in excruciating pain.

Questions were raised about diversion of the heroin for abuse by addicts; about the type of signal we would be sending to the American people—particularly our children—concerning the use of heroin; about the severity of penalties for abuse of the proposed program.

As I said at the time, I had misgivings about the protections against diversion of heroin in the bill reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee. But I believed a program could be developed to prevent those potential problems. As you may recall, I offered an amendment to the Waxman bill to address some of these concerns. Yet both the amendment and the bill failed to pass.

From the start of this Congress, HENRY WAXMAN and I have been work-

ing together to develop a tighter and more fully enforceable program to allow physicians to prescribe heroin for the small group of terminally ill cancer patients who cannot be effectively treated for intractable pain with existing pain medications. Among the bill's safeguards are severe criminal penalties for diverting heroin from the program.

These provisions, coupled with the major law enforcement measures that we enacted last October, I believe are fully adequate to protect the public from the danger of diversion.

We need this legislation. While there are many powerful painkilling drugs on the market, they do not work for everyone. Some work very well for many people and yet do little to help others. Heroin has been used extensively in British hospices and has been thoroughly demonstrated to be a safe and highly effective painkiller. While the number of cancer patients who would benefit from the availability of heroin is not great, I believe compassion requires that nothing that is safe and effective be held back in the treatment of cancer pain.

Our legislation does not legalize heroin just as we have not legalized the morphine now used in hospitals and hospices around the country. It would be available only to the terminally ill through a temporary program. Every aspect of the program is subject to the tight controls of the Controlled Substances Act to prevent any heroin from being diverted to drug addicts.

I take pride in my work over the past 4 years, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, in giving law enforcement agencies new legal tools and additional resources to fight the illegal drug traffic. We still have a great deal of work to do to defeat the narcotics traffickers and end drug abuse.

But we must not allow those who suffer in agony to be held hostages in pain by the drug abuse problem. This program, I believe, will prevent diversion and will carefully make medicine available to those who are most in need of it.●

#### THE INTERGENERATIONAL EDUCATION VOLUNTEER NETWORK ACT OF 1985

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today, myself and 41 original cosponsors are introducing the Intergenerational Education Volunteer Network Act of 1985. Support of this bill is a direct statement in support of education. This bill would establish intergenerational education programs which will

provide opportunities for senior citizens to work with educationally disadvantaged children.

Senator CARL LEVIN is also introducing a companion bill in the Senate. It is our intention with this collective effort to not only upgrade the basic skills of educationally disadvantaged, but to enhance the quality of learning and growth of children. We strongly believe that intergenerational education programs would enrich the lives of both younger and older Americans.

Highlights of provisions of both Senator LEVIN's and my bill are as follows:

Senior citizen volunteers aged 60 years and older would work directly with educationally disadvantaged children who are served under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Reimbursement would be provided for the senior volunteers to help pay necessary expenses associated with the cost of participating in the program;

Funding for training volunteers, teachers and participating parents or legal guardians would be provided in order to adapt and develop appropriate curricula materials to be used;

Senior citizen volunteers would spend most of their time in the classroom providing services to pupils in small groups or on a one-on-one basis as needed—the remainder of the time could be spent serving as liaison to the parents or legal guardians of the children with whom the volunteer is working in order to increase the participation of such families in the education of their children;

The Secretary of the Department of Education would be authorized to make grants to local educational agencies, public agencies, or to private nonprofit organizations applying jointly with one or more local educational agency for grant periods not to exceed 3 and not less than 2 years time, and the grantee would have to make a good faith effort to become either self sustaining or supported by the community by the end of the grant period;

The Director of the ACTION Agency or his/her designee would be included in the grant review process so that the expertise gathered through their experience with senior volunteer programs is considered;

A 10 percent administrative cap would be placed on the Department of Education, and a 10 percent administrative cap on each grantee; and

Each project would complete an evaluation of the program to be used by the Department of Education in the preparation of a report to be submitted to Congress every 2 years—the report shall include:

Descriptions of the programs authorized by this act;

Evaluation of these programs with respect to the realization of the stated purpose of this act; and

Summary and analysis of the collective impact of these programs.

Lastly, both Senator LEVIN's and my proposals set a 5-year authorization for this bill as follows: \$6 million for fiscal year 1986, \$7 million for 1987, \$8 million for 1988, \$9 million for 1989, and \$10 million for 1990.

Programs that involve senior citizens and parents in the education of their own children are by no means new. Unfortunately, the various pilot projects that are taking place around the country simply cannot meet the demand and the challenge in its entirety. It is estimated that over 11 million children of low-income families need help in basic skills. And, the current chapter 1 program for the education of disadvantaged children is currently reaching less than half that number.

As the president of the Washington, DC, based Home and School Institute, one of the program models on which this legislation is based, Dr. Dorothy Rich has a long record of service and experience with parents, senior volunteers, and schools across the Nation. In testimony before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Aging, Family, and Human Services on March 22, 1983, she stated the following:

Research on the importance of the family as educator is very clear—a question that needs to be addressed is not how to use the school to strengthen the family, but how to use the potency and impact of the family to strengthen the school. Research has clearly shown that the efforts of schools which do not involve families do not result in achievement for children.

Since 1978, the University of Pittsburgh Center for Social and Urban Research has been studying the affect senior citizens participating in its generations together Senior Citizen School Volunteer Program have had on children's growth and learning. Dr. Sally Newman, director of this program which is also one of the models on which this legislation is based determined that:

As a result of these programs there is an improvement in the academic performance and social behavior of children and youth and an improvement in the self-esteem, mental and physical health of the elderly. Over 35,000 youth and 1,500 older persons have benefitted from their participation in these programs that currently are in over 50 schools in western Pennsylvania. We know this model works.

I believe that this intergenerational effort will help the educationally disadvantaged keep pace with more fortunate youth. The programs this bill authorizes can and will make a difference in the lives of these children. By tapping the wealth of energy, experience and wisdom of the seniors of this country, they, themselves, will be enriched by having the opportunity to help make that difference. I urge my

colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.●

#### AMUSEMENT PARK SAFETY ACT

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. WYDEN and myself, I am pleased to introduce H.R. 1596, the "Amusement Park Safety Act." The legislation is similar to H.R. 5790 which was overwhelmingly passed by the House last year. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to take action on the bill prior to adjournment of the 98th Congress.

Each year millions of Americans enjoy the thrills and entertainment of amusement park rides. These rides have become increasingly complex. Many can generate speeds and velocity that might challenge an astronaut.

The public enjoys these rides. They assume the rides are safe, that they are well maintained and that their operators are experienced.

What the public doesn't know is that accidents have occurred at some of the Nation's finest amusement parks. Fatalities and serious injuries have resulted.

At hearings before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment last year, we heard testimony from a husband whose wife was killed when she fell out of a roller coaster. We also heard from a 15-year-old boy who, with his two friends, spent several days in the hospital after crashing 60 feet to the ground because a ride's braking mechanism failed.

The "Amusement Park Safety Act" closes a serious loophole in Federal law. Currently, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has authority to order defective amusement rides repaired only if they are located in a traveling carnival or circus. Yet if the identical defective ride is located in an amusement park, the agency is prohibited from assuring that the defect is repaired.

This distinction is illogical. It does not enhance consumer confidence or trust in the safety of amusement park rides.

H.R. 1596 would assure the public that in the event of a serious accident involving an amusement park ride, the Consumer Product Safety Commission would be empowered to inspect the ride, determine the cause of the accident, order its repair, and assure that similar rides in other States are inspected for defects and if necessary, be repaired.

No agency of the Federal Government presently has this responsibility. Furthermore, less than half of all the States have passed laws requiring peri-

odic inspection of amusement park rides. In those States that have enacted laws, the level of enforcement is uneven and inconsistent.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation narrowly defines the role of the CPSC. The Commission and its enforcement staff will not be permitted to conduct routine inspections of amusement park rides in States which have passed inspection laws. The only time CPSC could inspect an amusement ride in such States would be following an accident on an amusement park ride which involved a fatality or personal injury requiring hospitalization.

In addition, the CPSC would be prohibited from issuing industry-wide product safety standards or banning an amusement ride.

Mr. Speaker, legislation identical to H.R. 1596 is being introduced in the Senate by Senator PAUL SIMON. I am hopeful the Congress can expedite passage of the legislation before the summer amusement park season.

I ask that a copy of H.R. 1596 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 1596

A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to strengthen the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission over amusement devices

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Amusement Park Safety Act".

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Consumer Product Safety Act.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

(a) DEFINITION OF AMUSEMENT RIDE.—(1) Section 3(a)(1) (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(1)) is amended by striking out the first two sentences following subparagraph (I).

(2) Section 3(a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(15) The term 'amusement ride' means any device which carries or conveys passengers along, around, or over a fixed or restricted route or course or within a defined area for the purpose of giving its passengers amusement and which is customarily controlled or directed by an individual who is employed for that purpose and who is not a consumer with respect to such device. An amusement ride which is not permanently fixed to a site is a consumer product for purposes of this Act and an amusement ride which is permanently fixed to a site—

"(A) is not a consumer product for purposes of sections 7 and 8, and

"(B) is a consumer product for the remainder of the Act.

"(16) The term 'amusement ride operator' means the owner of an amusement ride."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a)(1)(I) is amended by striking out ". The term 'food', as used in this subparagraph means all 'food'".

SEC. 3. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.

Section 6(b) (15 U.S.C. 2055(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1) by striking out "the Commission shall" through the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Commission shall, to the extent practicable, notify and provide a summary of the information to—

"(A) each manufacturer or private labeler of the consumer product, and

"(B) to each amusement ride operator who owns the amusement ride

to which the information pertains, if the manner in which such consumer product or amusement ride is to be designated or described in such information will permit the public to ascertain readily the identity of such manufacturer, private labeler, or amusement ride operator and shall provide such manufacturer, private labeler, or amusement ride operator with a reasonable opportunity to submit comments to the Commission regarding such information."; and

(2) in the second and third sentences of paragraph (1) and in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking out "or private labeler" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "private labeler, or amusement ride operator".

#### SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION AND REMEDIES.

(a) NOTIFICATION OF COMMISSION.—Section 15(b) (15 U.S.C. 2064(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Each amusement ride operator who obtains information which reasonably supports the conclusion that the amusement ride the operator owns contains a defect which could create a substantial product hazard described in subsection (a)(2) shall provide the information required by the preceding sentence."

(b) REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, REFUND.—Section 15(d) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "of such product" in the first sentence the following: "or the amusement ride operator if the product is an amusement ride"; and

(2) by inserting before "or from doing" in the last sentence the following: "from operating an amusement ride if the product involved is an amusement ride".

#### SEC. 5. INSPECTION.

Section 16(a) (15 U.S.C. 2065(a)) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1), by striking out the period before the last sentence in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", by striking out the last sentence, and by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) to inspect, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner—

"(A) amusement rides which are not permanently fixed to a site, and

"(B) amusement rides which are permanently fixed to a site if the State or political subdivision in which the ride is located does not have authority to inspect the ride or if the ride was involved in a fatality or a personal injury requiring hospitalization.

Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness."

#### SEC. 6. REGULATIONS.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission shall issue regulations for the administration of section 15 of the Consumer Product Safety Act, as amended by section 4, not later than six months after the effective date of this Act.

#### SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect October 1, 1985.●

## THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND'S ST. PATRICK'S DAY STATEMENT

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day, the Friends of Ireland in the U.S. Congress issued a statement expressing our concerns and our hopes for a productive U.S. involvement in resolving the conflict that continues to drain hope from the lives of 1½ million people in Northern Ireland. As Members of the House and the Senate, we believe it is important that we lend our voices of support to the efforts of those who seek reconciliation through diplomacy and negotiations, rather than through a continuation of violence and terror.

Last year, I had the honor of introducing John Hume, a founding member of the New Ireland Forum, to a St. Patrick's luncheon in Cleveland, OH. As a leader of the Social Democratic Labor Party in Northern Ireland, Mr. Hume has been a tireless and articulate spokesman for peaceful change. In our statement this year, the Friends of Ireland express our hope that the work of the New Ireland Forum will continue to provide an outlet for those who believe in a peaceful transformation in Ulster.

Our statement also strongly opposes those who believe that violence is the proper outlet for change in Northern Ireland. No one, no matter what their belief on the question of Irish unity, can justify the use of terror by extremist elements who prey on the lives of innocents to advance their cause of instability. While it is often true that repression breeds retaliation, violence can never be the answer. It serves only to destroy, to hinder and to maim the spirit of those who strive to live in unity and in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Friends of Ireland's statement in the RECORD following my remarks:

#### FRIENDS OF IRELAND ST. PATRICK'S DAY STATEMENT 1985

St. Patrick's Day this year arrives at a time when those concerned about the future of Northern Ireland face difficult choices. As Friends of Ireland, we call on these men and women, whether American or Irish or British, to address the issues at hand with foresight, with courage, and with compassion for all the families who live in the troubled communities of Northern Ireland.

At issue are both the quality of life in Northern Ireland—shall justice, equity and tolerance for diversity govern?—and whether the future of Northern Ireland will be decided through constitutional, democratic means.

We look back on 1984 as a year of promise left unfulfilled, and express our hope that 1985 will bring visible progress toward reconciling the conflicting traditions of Northern Ireland and establishing democratic po-

litical structures able to accommodate diversity.

The report of the New Ireland Forum, long and eagerly awaited by the many friends of Ireland who have hoped—and continue to hope—that it would provide the basis for a long-sought new initiative by the parties involved in Northern Ireland, was published in 1984. We admire and commend the good will and hard work invested in the consensus reflected in the report and find irrefutable the Forum's conclusion that:

Existing structures and practices in Northern Ireland have failed to provide either peace, stability or reconciliation. The failure to recognize and accommodate the identity of the Northern nationalists has resulted in deep and growing alienation on their part from the system of political authority.

We are mindful of the growing urgency to demonstrate the viability of a political and diplomatic process with respect to Northern Ireland. Accordingly, we call on the Government of Great Britain, the responsible authority there, to accelerate its current dialogue with the Government of Ireland and to develop in conjunction with the Irish Government proposals which will lead to lasting peace and stability. We strongly support this dialogue and note that some progress has been made by the two governments in trying to reach agreement on the requirements for a solution to the problems of Northern Ireland.

We were pleased to read in the communique issued after the November 19, 1984 summit meeting between British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Irish Prime Minister Garret FitzGerald that they: "agreed on the need for efforts to diminish the divisions between the two communities in Northern Ireland and to reconcile the two major traditions that exist in the two parts of Ireland . . . (The identities of both the majority and minority communities in Northern Ireland should be recognized and respected, and reflected in the structures and processes of Northern Ireland in ways acceptable to both communities."

We also welcome efforts undertaken by the Government of Ireland to further accommodate confessional diversity in its democratic institutions. We know from the experience of our own nation that ethnic and religious pluralism can be a source of strength in a free society, and we look forward to the day when all of Ireland draws strength from such diversity.

As Friends of Ireland we call for the protection and enhancement of the rights of all the people of Northern Ireland. We are concerned that the minority Catholic community is dangerously and increasingly alienated from the institutions of public life. Majority rule without minority rights is not democracy; it has brought oppression. The Government of Great Britain, as the responsible authority in Northern Ireland, has an obligation to undertake to bridge the gulf that exists through the observance there of basic policy conventions that guide it elsewhere. These would include a return to due process in the judiciary, strengthening of efforts to end discriminatory practices in employment, and elimination of abuses of prisoners—specifically those referred to by Bishop James Malone, President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and leader of a delegation of American clergy, at the conclusion of their visit to Ireland on October 25, 1984. We deplore continuing use of lethal plastic bullets for crowd control by security

forces in Northern Ireland; the practice ought to be halted by Great Britain.

We again express in the strongest terms our determination to uphold the rule of law and to encourage deeper devotion to democratic principles and institutions, which are in the end the surest guarantors of individual liberty and minority rights. We oppose without qualification any resort to the bomb or the bullet as a way to promote political change. Political violence is morally abominable as well as inherently anti-democratic; there is no more place for it in Northern Ireland than there is in the United States.

We renew our plea to Americans not to provide support to those who advocate or engage in violence. It cannot help Ireland. The recent resurgence of killing in Northern Ireland only makes less likely a resolution of the fundamental political issues, and we ask that Americans of all backgrounds and faiths oppose the men of violence.

We renew here our support for the goal of Irish unity, and we invite Americans who want to see the troubles end in a peaceful, just and tolerant Irish society to join us in supporting—and actively encouraging—the process of reconciliation and compromise. The United States stands ready to assist that process through appropriate political and economic support. A delegation of Friends of Ireland led by Speaker O'Neill is currently visiting Ireland, and will discuss with the Government of Ireland, and other political leaders there, the American dimension to the issues in Northern Ireland.

On this St. Patrick's Day, we ask all true friends of Ireland in the United States to declare themselves for peace, as we urge the governments and leaders involved to make 1985 a year of real progress toward that peace.●

#### THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th anniversary of one of America's most respected programs, Medicare. Since its enactment, Medicare has contributed immeasurably to the health and well-being of millions of aged and disabled Americans by helping to ensure access to appropriate and affordable health care.

Today I introduce a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the program's success in protecting older Americans against the staggering costs of acute health care. This resolution recognizes and salutes the important contribution of Medicare to our Nation's health and well-being, and demonstrates our firm commitment to maintaining the integrity of the program.

Today more than 28 million older persons and 3 million disabled persons enjoy insurance protection under Medicare, making it the single largest personal health care financing program in the United States. Hundreds of

thousands of physicians and more than 20,000 hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, labs, and clinics participate in Medicare. Clearly, Medicare is one of the most vitally important and successful programs in the history of our Nation. Without it millions of older Americans could not afford even the most basic health care services.

Recently Congress responded to the need for less costly, more appropriate health care services by enhancing benefits to include hospice and health maintenance organization [HMO] services. In the coming year, Congress will continue to address the looming insolvency of the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund. To accomplish this, we must continue to seek ways to control the escalating cost of health care while ensuring access to high quality services.

I hope that you will join me in this commemoration of the 20th anniversary of Medicare. You will want to know that Senator JOHN HEINZ, chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and Senator JOHN GLENN, ranking minority member, have introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

A copy of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the success of the program in protecting older Americans against the high cost of health care

Whereas the Congress authorized Medicare in 1965 under title XVIII of the Social Security Act to consist of Hospital Insurance and Supplemental Medical Insurance;

Whereas Medicare has contributed immeasurably to the security, improved health, and extended longevity of older Americans;

Whereas Medicare provides health insurance coverage to 31 million aged and disabled persons, and is the largest personal health care financing program in the United States;

Whereas over half of all physicians serve Medicare patients, and over 20,000 hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, labs, clinics, and other organizations participate in Medicare;

Whereas Medicare is one of the most vitally important and successful programs in the history of the United States, without which many older Americans could not afford basic health care; and

Whereas one of the greatest social issues facing our nation today is maintaining the integrity of Medicare to ensure the health and well-being of all older Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the success of the program in helping to protect older Americans against the high cost of health care.●

#### THE BREAST CANCER TREATMENT INFORMED CONSENT ACT OF 1985

### HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the Breast Cancer Treatment Informed Consent Act of 1985.

Although breast cancer has long been the number one killer of women in the Western World, scientists still seek the cure and are continuously developing new methods of treatment. Too often, however, women do not know what treatments exist, or they are not given a choice between them. Until a cure for breast cancer can be found, every patient must be guaranteed the right to choose the best possible treatment for herself.

Last summer, my distinguished friend and chairman of the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care, CLAUDE PEPPER, and I chaired hearings on breast cancer. The testimony we heard was compelling. Every year, hundreds of thousands of women undergo biopsies, not knowing they will awaken to find that extensive surgery—surgery that leaves physical and emotional scars—has been performed. Fear of such surprises can inhibit breast cancer victims from seeking treatment altogether. However, this does not have to be.

Today there are alternative, less severe treatments for breast cancer which can be equally effective as conventional treatments. The New England Journal of Medicine just published a study by Dr. Bernard Fisher indicating that lumpectomy and radiation are as effective as the more radical and disfiguring total mastectomy in treating early breast cancer. All women need to know about the variety of options available to them. They need to be able to make their own informed decisions before treatment takes place.

My legislation requires States to enact laws requiring physicians and surgeons to inform breast cancer patients of alternative, effective methods of treatment in order to qualify for Federal funds under titles V and XIX of the Social Security Act and title XIX of the Public Health Service Act. Patients will have to be informed, both by means of a written summary and an oral explanation in layman's language understandable to them, of the available options and the advantages, disadvantages and risks associated with each procedure.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation addresses a vital need for educating patients and enabling them to choose what will

be done to their bodies when they have breast cancer. Until the cure can be found, my legislation will promote more informed, humane treatment of this dreaded disease.

As a woman, as the daughter of a breast cancer victim, and on behalf of the 115,000 American women stricken with breast cancer each year, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Breast Cancer Treatment Informed Consent Act of 1985. ●

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
CONGREGATION B'NAI ISRAEL  
OF STATEN ISLAND

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Congregation B'nai Israel of Staten Island, as it celebrates its Golden Jubilee Anniversary on May 19, 1985. I am sure my colleagues in this House agree that such an achievement deserves particular recognition.

In February 1935, 50 years ago, a group of 12 Jewish families living in Dongan Hills, Grant City, New Dorp, Richmondtown, and Great Kills banded together for the purpose of religious worship. After meeting in homes, stores, above a pub, and even a florist's greenhouse, they built a 1½ story structure in Grant City, calling themselves the South Shore Hebrew Alliance.

The influx of young Jewish veterans after the war into Staten Island resulted in an increase in the membership of the congregation.

In 1952, the name of the congregation was formally changed to B'nai Israel. The erection of the Berry Houses and South Beach Houses brought many more young couples to the synagogue. Under the guidance of student rabbis, children attended the Hebrew school. In 1965, the synagogue hired its first full-time rabbi.

Prewar plans to eliminate the grade crossings of the Staten Island Rapid Transit, on which the congregation was located, brought the synagogue to purchase its home in Bay Terrace. The original building was closed in 1966, but the new building was not completed until 1968. For those 2 years the congregation had many temporary homes, including a rented hall in Great Kills, a supermarket in New Dorp, and a rented Baptist Church school building in New Dorp. In the meantime they purchased a house near the new building site for their rabbi, where they conducted small worship services in the basement.

The Verrazano-Narrows Bridge brought a building boom to Staten Island, and with it an influx of young

Jews. Congregation B'nai Israel was prepared to welcome them with a well-organized synagogue.

Today the membership of the congregation is close to 300 families. The building is utilized each day and evening with programming for the old and young alike.

At the 50th anniversary dinner-dance, the congregation will honor two of its prominent couples: Leon and Edith Shapiro and Murray and Joyce Blyn. Edith Shapiro is the daughter of a founding father of the synagogue, Nathan Eisenberg. She has lived in the vicinity of the synagogue all her life—perhaps spending more time in the synagogue than in her own home. Mr. Shapiro came to the area after serving in the Navy during World War II, married here and has never left. He has served the congregation as a vice president, and for the last 15 years he has headed his favorite group, the ritual committee.

Murray and Joyce Blyn, the other honorees, are typical of the new influx. Both devoted to their professions and their heritage, they spend countless hours helping the children of the community and the synagogue. Mr. Blyn has served the congregation as a past president. He is a school teacher in Brooklyn, while his wife is the lower grade principal of Staten Island Academy. They have given of their expertise to help the religious school advance in all areas of learning and organization and still find time to head the fund-raising committees. The Blyn's, like the Shapiro's, are blessed with three children, two sons and a daughter.

Fifty years may seem like a long time, but for a religion that has a heritage of centuries it is just the twinkling of the eye. Nevertheless, we look upon Congregation B'nai Israel of Staten Island as a stone in the building of productive and purposeful people within the ranks of the Jewish people. Let me, therefore, once again wish them a mazel tov. May we hope that they will continue to serve our community for many years to come. ●

A PEACE PLAN FOR NICARAGUA

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the New Republic magazine carried an important commentary by Arturo Cruz, a former member of the ruling Sandinista junta and former Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States. He writes eloquently about Sandinistan oppression of civil liberties. Regardless of what this Congress does with aid to the Contras, he argues, only the San-

dinistas can create an open and just society and put an end to Nicaragua's civil war.

I'm sure my colleagues will find this article of interest, and ask that it be placed in the RECORD.

A PEACE PLAN FOR NICARAGUA

(By Arturo Cruz and Arturo Cruz, Jr.)

Nicaragua's elections last November, far from easing the country's crisis, only compounded it. The elections were neither free nor fair, and brought Nicaragua no closer to democracy. According to the annual report of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, the Sandinistas used their absolute control of the state to place themselves in a position of advantage over other contestants and to consolidate their power. The other governments of Central America, ranging from parliamentary democracies to military dictatorships, agreed. None of Nicaragua's neighbors sent delegations to the inauguration of President-elect Daniel Ortega. Carlos Andres Perez, the former president of Venezuela and now vice chairman of the Socialist International, publicly declined to attend, stating that "those of us who believe we have done so much for the Sandinista revolution feel cheated because sufficient guarantees were not provided to assure the participation of all political forces." Andres Perez called upon Ortega "to reflect upon what the rest of the world hoped for from the great revolution of all the Nicaraguan people: political pluralism, a mixed economy, and non-alignment—as the revolution pledged—conveying the true wishes of its people."

We of the democratic opposition within Nicaragua have consistently made the same appeal. Our organization, the Coordinadora Democratica, which is the largest opposition group in the country, planned to register for the November elections provided the government guaranteed that opposition leaders and their followers could assemble, organize, and campaign freely. But refusing to meet even the most minimal concessions, the Sandinistas made it impossible for the Coordinadora to run. We were not alone. Virgilio Godoy, a former Sandinista labor minister and the widely respected leader of the Independent Liberal Party, also withdrew from the race. Even the docile splinter parties that ran in the campaign have now joined the outright opposition in their demands against the regime. The socialist and the communist parties have both signed a document denouncing the dire state of public affairs and the electoral process.

The opposition leaders—politicians (including Godoy), labor leaders, and businessmen—told me in January that they intend to remain inside Nicaragua whatever the consequences. But as the Sandinistas encounter more popular pressure to open up the political process, their tactics are likely to prove less effective, and they will curtail civil liberties even more.

The Sandinistas are stepping up their struggle against the armed resistance as well. They are vigorously increasing both the volume and quality of their military operations. They have acquired weaponry far more sophisticated than that of any other Central American country. Outside of Nicaragua, the Sandinistas are waging a propaganda campaign, designed to distort the truth about the rebellion. They are attempting to get the rebels off their backs either through direct negotiations with Washington, or by undermining United

States support for the insurgents in Congress and among the American public by claiming that they have no popular support.

Likewise, the Sandinistas profess a willingness to reach an accommodation through the Contadora peace process. Their true intention, though, is to reserve a free hand for the consolidation of their power in exchange for a few tactical security commitments to the United States at the regional level. Nicaragua's neighbors oppose this kind of solution, knowing that unless the Sandinistas accept democracy they will always pose a threat to regional peace.

Now that the space for democratic action has narrowed, it is all the more critical for the opposition to use its few remaining political options effectively. Supporters of democracy in Nicaragua must understand that blanket support for the Sandinistas or opposition to the Reagan administration will not bring permanent peace to Nicaragua. It is necessary to remove the causes of what has become virtually a civil war, including those for which the Sandinistas are responsible. The Sandinistas' excesses have incited Nicaraguans to armed rebellion. Now the Sandinistas must make genuine modifications in their policies if we are to avoid national bloodshed.

Four points must be kept in mind.

First, the armed opposition in Nicaragua has real social basis. What is true of the insurgency in El Salvador also applies in Nicaragua: you cannot manufacture revolutions. The sheer fact that the ranks of the so-called *contras* now include 12,000 to 15,000 men is a telling sign that something is genuinely wrong in Nicaragua. The rebels can no longer be dismissed as "mercenaries." They have gone from being an instrument of U.S. policy to a social movement.

Second, it follows that the fundamental conflict in Nicaragua is among Nicaraguans. The question "Can the United States learn to live with a revolutionary regime?" is misplaced. The problem is not between Washington and Managua. It cannot be resolved by the talks between representatives of the Sandinista government and the Reagan Administration that have been held in recent months in the Mexican city of Manzanillo. The real question is whether Nicaraguans can or should learn to live with a vanguard—the Sandinistas—whose ideological ambitions are rejected by the rest of the society.

Third, in order for the Nicaraguan revolution to survive and to become a model for all of Central America, the Sandinistas must modify their ideological ambitions. The Sandinista ideology is sometimes called Marxist-Leninist, but that label cannot mean much in a country that has practically no working class. What matters is that the shopkeepers are furious with the restrictions of the government, the farmworkers want to be left alone, the city dwellers don't want to be watched by the block committees. But whether the Sandinistas have enough autonomy from the Soviet Union and Cuba to modify their totalitarian inclinations is open to serious doubt.

Fourth, it is important to recognize the possibility that for the Sandinistas ideology and political practicality may go hand in hand. It may be that the Sandinistas have so alienated the Nicaraguan people that if they do not exercise absolute power, they will exercise no power at all. Even if they now made room for the opposition, they might not be able to control the discontent. The people speaking through the democratic process might demand new leaders. The

Sandinistas would have to hand over power to others, which they would never do. Or they would have to repress the Nicaraguan people ever more violently.

We do not yet assume that is too late to negotiate. In the coming days the democratic opposition leaders will challenge the Sandinistas to a national dialogue. With a sense of urgency we want to explore the last hope of achieving peace through national reconciliation and democracy and by avoiding the catastrophe of bloodshed that otherwise lies ahead. We urge President Ortega to avoid the ideological blackmail of his more extremist supporters. In the national insurrection against Somoza, Ortega showed imagination and flexibility in working with all sectors of Nicaraguan society. We hope that he will show similar imagination and flexibility now and prevent a full-scale civil war.

To begin with, we need a gesture of goodwill from each side. The rebels should proclaim a unilateral ceasefire, and the Sandinistas should proclaim an effective amnesty for all political prisoners. Everyone who is in jail for political crimes—some 1,400 people, according to the Nicaraguan Human Rights Commission—should be released immediately.

From these measures we need to move to create the proper climate for a national debate on Nicaragua's future. We in the opposition have long called for the separation of the Sandinista party and the state. But even before that, the state and the party both must get out of civil society. This means that freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and freedom of movement must be guaranteed. *La Prensa* must be allowed to publish what it wants. University students must be allowed to read what they want and not just the books published in Moscow. (In Nicaragua today, students are not allowed to read Gramsci or Trotsky.) The block committees, the so-called Committees in Defense of the Revolution, must end their role as instruments of social control. They must not, for example, be the organization that distributes rationing cards. Once these measures are taken, the conditions will exist for Nicaraguans alone to freely decide Nicaragua's future. We ask the Sandinistas: Can you withstand free ideological debate?

If the Government and the opposition come to some kind of formal pact about Nicaragua's future, we propose that the bishops of Nicaragua, in the presence of representatives of the other Central American governments and Contadora countries, act as witnesses, supervisors, and guarantors of whatever agreement is reached.

To begin this debate, we offer these specific and moderate points. We must rectify the injustices of the last election with a new electoral process. President Ortega should remain as president within the parameters of the Sandinistas' original Plan of Government offered in 1979. However, the assembly elected in November should be dissolved and a new, genuinely open campaign held. The reconstituted assembly should then draw up a new constitution and establish an independent judiciary. Eventually a national plebiscite can be held to decide whether Nicaragua needs a new president.

But it is not the details that are most important. What matters is the commitment to democratic institutions governed by regular popular elections. Unlike the guerrillas in El Salvador, we are not demanding power, we are demanding only our rights. We do not want a military solution; we want a constitutional solution. But the Sandinistas

have driven tens of thousands of Nicaraguans to believe that there is no alternative but armed struggle. The U.S. Congress may cut off aid to these forces, but that will not change their minds; nor will it end the conflict. Only the creation of a just and open society will end Nicaragua's civil war. It is now the Sandinistas' obligation to contribute to the creation of that society and to redeem the promise of the Nicaraguan revolution. ●

## PROTECTION NEEDED FOR OUR DRUG ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help protect the safety and security of our Federal drug law enforcement officers. This bill would pay rewards to individuals providing information leading to the arrest and conviction of persons guilty of kidnaping or killing a Federal drug law enforcement agent.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to wage an effective battle against illegal drug trafficking, we must put into practice measures to ensure the safety of Federal drug law enforcement officers. My bill would amend the controlled Substances Act by providing awards of up to \$100,000 to individuals providing information that brings about the arrest or conviction of any person who kidnap or kills a Federal drug law enforcement agent.

The funding of these rewards would be taken from the repository of forfeiture proceeds within the Department of Justice. This includes any property, including money, seized in a drug bust. Thus drug traffickers would foot the bill for this legislation and no additional burden would be placed upon the Federal budget.

By implementing this legislation, I feel we can further penetrate the illicit world of drug traffickers. As we work to stop all drug trafficking and abuse, we must provide security to those brave men and women who work so diligently to enforce the drug laws of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Federal Drug Law Enforcement Agent Protection Act of 1985.

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the payment of rewards to individuals providing information leading to the arrest and conviction of persons guilty of killing or kidnaping a Federal drug law enforcement agent

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Drug Law Enforcement Agent Protection Act of 1985".*

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 511 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 881(e)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after "(e)" the following: "(1)";

(2) redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively; and

(3) striking out the matter following subparagraph (D), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2)(A) The proceeds from any sale under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) and any moneys forfeited under this title shall be used to pay—

"(i) all property expenses of the proceedings for forfeiture and sale including expenses of seizure, maintenance of custody, advertising, and court costs, and

"(ii) awards of up to \$100,000 to any individual who provides original information which leads to the arrest and conviction of a person who kills or kidnaps a Federal drug law enforcement agent.

Any award paid for information concerning the killing or kidnaping of a Federal drug law enforcement agent, as provided in clause (ii), shall be paid at the discretion of the Attorney General.

"(B) The Attorney General shall forward to the Treasurer of the United States for deposit in accordance with section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, any amounts of such moneys and proceeds remaining after payment of the expenses provided in subparagraph (A)."

TRIBUTE TO ALFRED W.  
PELLETIER

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to call attention to a constituent and a friend.

Alfred W. Pelletier, 63, was born in Toronto, Ontario, where he attended the Danforth Technical School, graduating in 1939. He joined the Toronto Transportation Commission the same year as an apprentice mechanic.

In 1941, he volunteered for service in the Royal Canadian Navy, and remained in the service for the duration of World War II, with over 3 years on convoy escort duty in the North Atlantic. Released from active duty as a chief petty officer in 1945, he rejoined the Toronto Transportation Commission as a journeyman mechanic, and subsequently was promoted to assistant shop foreman.

Pelletier was first associated with Mack Trucks, Inc., in 1952, when he joined the company's Canadian subsidiary—now known as Mack Canada Inc.—as a shop foreman in Toronto. He was promoted to service manager in 1954, remained in that position for the next 6 years, and was elevated to Canadian service manager in 1960. Over the next decade, he rose steadily through the ranks of the Mack Canada organization, holding such positions as distributor sales manager, branch operations manager, and Canadian sales manager.

In 1970, he was appointed general manager of Mack Canada, followed by election to executive vice president and general manager the following year. In the latter capacity, he directed a major expansion of Mack Canada, a project that more than quadrupled the company's production capacity. He was elevated to president of Mack Canada in 1974.

Pelletier was named president of Mack Trucks, Inc., on January 1, 1976. Three months later, he became the company's chief executive officer, and in July 1979, the board of director selected to the additional position of chairman of the board. His official title became chairman of the board and chief executive officer in July 1980, and chairman of the board on January 1, 1984.

Pelletier's professional affiliations include the Society of Automotive Engineers and the Western Highway Institute, director and eastern vice president at large. He is chairman of the Youth Development Foundation Sponsoring Committee and the National Advisory Committee of the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America, and is an active national spokesperson on behalf of quality vocational education.

In the Lehigh Valley area of Pennsylvania, Pelletier's many civic activities include the Minsi Trails council of the Boy Scouts of America, president, chairman of Trust Fund Committee; the United Way in Lehigh County, 1985 president, chairman of 1984 Loaned Executive Committee, and 1983 general campaign chairman; the Parkettes National Gymnastic Team, chairman of the building fund; and the Pennsylvania State Company, board member. Pelletier was awarded the degree of doctor of humanities by the board of trustees of Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales in 1984.

The award he will receive on March 21, 1985, the Champion of Liberty Award, is yet another honor bestowed upon him during his already distinguished career.

Mr. Speaker, individuals like Alfred W. Pelletier make our community a better place to live.●

IN MEMORY OF MARTIN "MIKE"  
DENN, FOUNDER OF AMERICAN LUPUS SOCIETY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Mike Denn, who died Wednesday, October 31, 1984 at South Bay Hospital in Redondo Beach, CA.

Mike Denn was a lieutenant in the Navy in World War II and a successful businessman, but I came to know him

in his capacity as the founder of the American Lupus Society. We worked closely on legislation to create a greater awareness of the disease lupus erythematosus and find a cure for it. He founded the American Lupus Society in 1973 after his daughter, Bonnie, died of the disease. The American Lupus Society is dedicated to finding a cure for this dreadful disease and assisting victims of it, and now has 50 chapters in 19 States.

Lupus erythematosus is a disease that in its mildest form only causes skin rashes and constant fatigue in its victims. But a more serious form of this disease attacks all of the internal organs and joints of the body and is often fatal. There are currently some 500,000 lupus victims in America today.

Mike worked tirelessly to aid these victims and find a way to keep future generations from being victimized by lupus. In 1978, he was instrumental in having a National Lupus Week declared by Congress to focus attention on this disease. He lived just long enough to see last year's Lupus Awareness Week, which was October 21-27. He also worked closely on legislation to create a coordinating council of National Institute of Health Directors to coordinate lupus research.

Mike's single-minded dedication to finding a cure for lupus did not prevent him from contributing to the community in other ways. He was a member of the Torrance, CA, Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, and an honorary member of the Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach Rotary Clubs. In 1980, he was voted the Torrance YMCA's "Good Neighbor."

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife, Betty—"Barney" to her friends—and to his son, Mike Jr. The loss of Mike Denn is a tragic one and he will be sorely missed, but the organization he molded survives, and the fight against lupus will go on. Someday, thanks to him, perhaps no one will suffer from this disabling disease.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
JOSEPH AND ROSE PALUMBO  
OF TOTOWA, NJ, RECIPIENTS,  
1985 DISTINGUISHED COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD, NINETEEN HEARTS SOCIETY OF THE FEDERATION OF ITALIAN SOCIETIES

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday March 24, the residents of the Borough of Totowa, city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of

New Jersey will join with the members of one of our most prestigious Italian-American organizations, the Nineteen Hearts Society of the Federation of Italian Societies, in testimony to the good works of two distinguished citizens, community leaders, and good friends—the Honorable Joseph Palumbo and the Honorable Rose Palumbo of Totowa, NJ. Mr. and Mrs. Palumbo are a husband and wife team of distinction whose personal commitment and lifetime of good deeds in service to people have earned them the highly coveted annual community service award of the Nineteen Hearts Society.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Rose and Joseph Palumbo and share the pride of their children: daughters Laura and Carole, as they celebrate this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. and Mrs. Palumbo have, by their example and many accomplishments in civic, community, and charitable endeavors, personified a quality of leadership, dedication, and sincerity of purpose that have truly enriched the cultural endeavors of our community, State, and Nation.

Joseph, with the inspiration and assistance of his first lady Rose, and vice versa, together have provided outstanding and responsible service to our people. Their personal commitment to the economic, social, and cultural renewal of the community and State of their residence and career pursuits is applauded by all of us.

Mr. Palumbo was born and raised in Paterson, NJ, where he attended local schools. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II and attended New York University. He received his law degree from NYU Law School and is a New Jersey realtor and appraiser. Mrs. Palumbo was born in New York City and at an early age moved with her parents to Little Ferry, NJ, where she attended local schools. Joseph and Rose have been married for 29 years and have resided in Totowa Borough for over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, this distinguished couple have been actively involved in the business and industrial community of the Paterson area—Joseph as the entrepreneur of the J.F. Palumbo Realty Agency in the Borough of West Paterson and Rose as an employee of Thermwell Products Co. in the city of Paterson. They have demonstrated their devotion to their family and children, yet always finding time to serve a larger family, the Paterson area community. This community involvement reflects their sincere concern for their community and its people and includes the following activities in community affairs:

It is important to note that Mr. Palumbo is a former councilman and trustee of the Board of Education of the Borough of Totowa and past commander of the Pasquariello Bradle Post No. 187, American Legion, Paterson. He is currently president of Multiple Listing Service of Northern New Jersey; president, Passaic Valley Chamber of Commerce; and finance officer, Passaic County Democratic Committee. Mrs. Palumbo is also a member of the Totowa Women's Club.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting its distinguished community service awards to Joseph and Rose Palumbo, the Nineteen Hearts Society of the Federation of Italian Societies wishes to particularly commend their many years in service to the entire Paterson area community.

Rose and Joseph Palumbo have achieved in their lifetime the respect and esteem of all of us who have had the good fortune to know them. It is to their modesty in their achievements, their outstanding expertise in their chosen field of endeavor, the warmth of their friendship and sincerity of purpose in the American way of life that I join with the Nineteen Hearts Society in seeking this national recognition of their service to our community and fellowman.

Mr. Speaker, we are especially appreciative of their many contributions to the quality of life and well-being of our citizenry. For their personal commitment and lifetime of good deeds in service to our people we do indeed salute two outstanding individuals, good friends and great Americans—the 1985 Community Service Award honorees of the Nineteen Hearts Society of the Federation of Italian Societies—the Honorable Joseph Palumbo and the Honorable Rose Palumbo of Totowa, NJ.●

COL. ROSS DAVIDSON HONORED

HON. GENE CHAPPIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. CHAPPIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to announce the designation of Col. Ross Davidson as honorary mayor and honorary member of congress of Quintette, CA. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Davidson has played an instrumental role in the development of Quintette. He has resided in Quintette for the past 30 years during which time he served as a member and president of the Quintette Service District. Through Colonel Davidson's vital service, Quintette has become one of California's most beautiful and treasured towns.

Mr. Speaker, not only does Colonel Davidson's record of achievements in the town of Quintette demonstrate his

character and talents, but his past service record as a member of the U.S. Air Force further demonstrates his sacrifice and love for our country. Colonel Davidson's 28 years of service in the Air Force includes 49 U.S. awards, foreign awards, and decorations. During his service as a combat pilot in World War II and Vietnam, Colonel Davidson flew 87 combat missions, having his aircraft damaged by enemy fire during 30 of those missions.

Colonel Davidson's commitment to the United States continued while he served 6 years in exploration of the North Polar Basin, and, along with Admiral Byrd and Admiral Peary, is a member of the world renowned Explorers Club. One of Colonel Davidson's most impressive experiences is his command of the construction and testing of a \$1 billion chain of radar stations across 3,000 miles of arctic wasteland, from Alaska to Greenland. Before Colonel Davidson was put on the job, the construction of these early warning radar stations was considered impossible. Now, however, due to Colonel Davidson's efforts, these stations have been completed and are operating to protect our safety.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege for me to honor an individual who perfectly demonstrates the American spirit of adventure, love of country, and unselfishness. Mr. Speaker, I proudly designate Col. Ross Davidson as honorary mayor and honorary congressman of Quintette, CA.●

LEGISLATION TO REDUCE USE OF LEAD IN GASOLINE

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill that will help reduce the serious environmental pollution caused by leaded gasoline.

The bill has two parts. The first would require that leaded gasoline be sold for at least as much as unleaded gasoline, in order to eliminate the price incentive for "fuel switching"—the deliberate use of leaded gasoline in cars designed for unleaded gasoline. The second would codify a 90-percent reduction in the lead content of gasoline by the end of this year.

Together, these two steps will contribute greatly to a major improvement in air quality. Enactment of the bill will result almost immediately in a sharp drop in the use of leaded gasoline, followed soon after by a drastic reduction in the amount of lead contained in each gallon of the leaded gasoline that would continue to be used.

The use of lead in gasoline is a serious problem because of the terrible damage lead does to human health. Exposure to lead—80 percent of which comes from automobile exhausts—causes higher incidences of mental retardation, anemia, and kidney damage, particularly in children. Furthermore, leaded gasoline contains ethylene dibromide [EDB], a potent carcinogen which is added to prevent buildup of lead deposits inside automobile engines. The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has estimated that 300,000 pounds of unburned EDB are emitted annually from the tailpipes of cars using leaded gasoline, and that persons living or working near gas stations and refineries are therefore exposed to potentially dangerous concentrations of evaporated EDB in the air. And newly developed information just announced by the EPA shows a relationship between elevated blood lead levels and high blood pressure, an important new reason to reduce the lead in our environment.

This bill complements the regulation issued on March 4 by the EPA requiring a similar reduction in the lead content of leaded gasoline. Although this recent EPA action was welcome, the history of this issue suggests that congressional intervention would be well advised. In the face of overwhelming evidence of the serious health consequences of excessive lead emissions, the EPA took far too long to issue the new regulation.

More importantly, the EPA regulation does not even address the problem of fuel switching. An estimated 12 to 20 percent of all motorists use leaded gas in cars designed for unleaded gas only, because leaded is about 7 cents per gallon cheaper at the pump. Use of leaded gasoline in these cars destroys the catalytic converters that reduce emissions of other harmful pollutants, making such cars even worse polluters than those designed to use leaded gasoline without converters. One estimate projects that, by 1990, this deliberate fuel switching will result in 20 percent more emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide than would be the case if everyone with a catalytic converter burned unleaded gasoline.

Because this problem is not dealt with in the EPA proposal, the first part of this bill is needed to eliminate the price incentive for fuel switching and would do so within 90 days. This part would require wholesalers and retailers to charge at least as much for leaded gasoline as they do for regular unleaded gasoline, resulting in an almost immediate sharp drop in the use of leaded gasoline. Eliminating the price advantage for leaded gasoline will also make it cheaper in the long run for car owners to use unleaded gas, because lead inevitably fouls

spark plugs, making more frequent tuneups necessary.

The second part of this bill would codify the 90-percent reduction in the amount of lead used in leaded gasoline by January 1, 1986, as recently ordered by the EPA. Although it is frequently claimed that certain older cars require leaded gasoline to prevent valve wear, they can safely use gasoline with 0.1 grams of lead per gallon, as allowed by the bill; according to studies conducted by the EPA, there will be no damage to these autos. In fact, new evidence suggests any car can use unleaded gas without damage, even those cars designed for leaded gas.

By removing the economic incentive for fuel switching and by reducing drastically the lead in the remaining leaded gasoline that would be used, we can make tremendous progress toward cleaner, healthier air. This bill would begin that process by producing a significant improvement almost immediately, and even more improvement by 1986. The problem has been studied and debated for years, and now it is time to act. I hope all my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this important legislation. ●

#### FOURTH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL STUDENT PROGRAM

### HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to welcome the following members of the Fourth District Congressional Student Program from Indiana, to Washington, DC, this week: Deb Kiess, Belmont High School; Sue Ann Kahlenbeck, Huntington North High School; Jill Sullivan, Bishop Dwenger High School; Mindy Hoffer, New Haven High School; Scott Daniels, Jay County High School; Tim Bassett, DeKalb High School, Mary Lynn Kohrman, Elmhurst High School; Scott Wise, Westview High School; Randall Redman, Howe Military Academy; Clarice Kae McMillan, Southern Wells High School; Gretchen Matz, Wayne High School; Courtney Stillman, Homestead High School; Stacie Dee Schrader, Columbia City Joint High School; Frank E. Weller, Garrett High School; Julie Myers, Carroll High School; Stephen M. Wallen, Paul Harding High School, Brian Thornton, Churubusco High School; Daniel Grossman, Lakeland High School, Troy Chapman, East Noble High School; Lee Ann Lantz, Fremont High School; Christopher C. Zenk, Eastside High School; Nelson Schuman, Whitko High School; Ron Yoder, West Noble High School; Shelly Freck, Hamilton Community Schools; William Kelly Small, South

Side High School; Ann Link, Bluffton High School; Deborah Geer, Angola High School; Candace Aplin, Prarie Heights Community High School; Jill Stanley, Concordia Lutheran High School; David Stieglitz, Woodlan High School; Robin Roe, Adams Central High School; John Kruse, South Adams High School; Robert Earl, Leo Junior/Senior High School; Donald C. Bradley, Norwell High School; Colleen Coonrod, Heritage High School; Anarene Holt, Northrop High School; Cathleen S. Sullivan, Bishop Luers High School; Victoria Kilgore, North Side High School; Doug Roth, Fort Wayne Christian School; Michelle Liston, Black Hawk Christian School; Jeff Brown, Huntington Catholic High School; Nichole Poignard, Snider High School; and special thanks to chaperones Marvin and Gretna Morgan of Churubusco and Delain Wright of Fort Wayne.

Each year every high school in my district has the opportunity to select one student to participate in the program. A nonpartisan board of directors chooses the participant out of numerous applicants. I wish to congratulate these students and commend their spirit and zeal. Throughout this week they will have occasion to view the Government in action by observing many aspects of the democratic process. They will have opportunities to see each of the three branches of Government function independently as well as in accordance with one another.

My special thanks to Senators RICHARD LUGAR and DAN QUAYLE and my colleagues HENRY HYDE, HANK BROWN, BILL NELSON, RON WYDEN, STEVE GUNDERSON, LEE HAMILTON, and PAUL HENRY for their cooperation in meeting with these fine young people.

The week in which the Fourth District Congressional students are in Washington is one of my favorite weeks of the year. It is exciting, as well as fun to associate with these students and feel of their enthusiasm and spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congressional Student Program provides an excellent opportunity to these outstanding young men and women to explore Washington, DC and discover the city both at work and at leisure. They will be able to frequent the wonderful sites in and around this celebrated city as well as observe the men and women who serve this great country in their natural habitat. I hope that participation in this program will foster their active participation in Government and civic service in the future.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is with delight that I welcome these students to our Nation's Capitol. ●

**AMERICAN RED CROSS AND THE CIVIL AIR PATROL JOIN HANDS TO PROVIDE TRANSPLANTATION SERVICES TO NATION**

**HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, March 13, 1985, the American Red Cross and the Civil Air Patrol signed an agreement which will have profound effect on the process of obtaining human tissues for transplantation to patients across the Nation.

Simply put, the Civil Air Patrol, which currently works with the U.S. Air Force and the American Red Cross in transporting human blood in emergency situations, and in providing disaster relief, now has undertaken to assist also in transporting American Red Cross personnel to sites where donor tissues are available, and after these tissues are obtained, transporting them to locations where patients are in need of them.

Also, the Civil Air Patrol will collaborate with the American Red Cross in a number of educational programs to inform the American public about the need for, and the uses of, tissues and vital organs and also will encourage and support the concept of consent for donation.

We are all aware of the enormous strides that have been made in medical research which now permit the transplantation of organs and tissues from one human to another; and we are also aware that there has been considerable difficulty in increasing the donor pool, in locating donors in individual cases where patients need such organs, and the rapid transportation of such materials.

I am very pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues this new agreement which is at the very leading edge of providing such services to the people of this Nation. Both organizations have a long and distinguished record of service, and this is just another step forward to improving the health of our citizens.

At the signing ceremony, Richard F. Schubert, president of the American Red Cross, indicated his great pleasure that the agreement had been signed, and indicated that the American Red Cross would be pressing forward just as swiftly as possible to take advantage of these new arrangements.

The American Red Cross has long been recognized for its work in war relief and disaster relief, but is lesser known in its remarkable work in the area of blood donation programs, the processing of blood, plasma, plasma derivatives, and other blood products. Last year, for example, the American Red Cross collected 6,095,689 units of

blood in its 57 regions across the country, and distributed blood and blood products to approximately 4,400 hospitals and clinics across the Nation.

Now the American Red Cross is becoming deeply involved in research on tissues and organ banking services needed for transplantation programs. Also, it should be noted that the American Red Cross conducts valuable research in other areas, including transfusion-transmissible diseases such as hepatitis and cytomegalovirus infections, and is making research advances in plasma protein research. The American Red Cross has also initiated studies of viral factors associated with acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS].

It should also be noted that the Civil Air Patrol has had an extraordinary history. I am pleased to note that the national headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol is at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, AL. My colleagues may not be aware that the Civil Air Patrol performs in excess of 85 percent of all of the air search and rescues each year in this country at the request of the Air Force. The Civil Air Patrol's emergency services mission also includes civil defense and disaster relief operations in support of local, State, Federal, and other national emergency services organizations. All of these services are done by the all volunteer Civil Air Patrol members. During 1983, the Civil Air Patrol flew 16,725 hours on 17,745 Air Force authorized search and rescue missions, and was credited with locating 1,074 search objectives and saving 154 lives.

Also, many of my colleagues will not know that there are 26,104 cadets between the ages of 14 and 18, and 41,669 senior members over the age of 18, in the program. It was my pleasure last Wednesday to be visited by several of the key individuals involved in this new agreement, including Brig. Gen. William B. Cass, the Civil Air Patrol national commander; Col. John T. Massingale, U.S. Air Force, who is the executive director; Thomas A. Handley, legal counsel to the Civil Air Patrol, who is located at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery; Col. Roland E. Wiegant, a member of the Legislative Liaison Committee for national headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol; as well as Harold T. Meryman, M.D., assistant director and head, Cryo Laboratory/Bethesda, American Red Cross; and Barbara McKeever of the American Red Cross.●

**SHAMROCK SUMMIT**

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday, President Reagan was

in Canada for a series of meetings with Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. The so called Shamrock Summit encompassed several significant issues of the day, including the pressing one of acid rain control.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of acid rain worsens as we speak. Yet, while Canada has recently taken direct action with a new 10-point plan for reducing acid rain, the Reagan administration continues to stall.

Canada, and its conservative government, are to be applauded for their recent attack on acid rain. Their program calls for a 50-percent reduction of sulfur dioxide by 1994. It also sets new tough auto standards which will reduce nitrogen oxide emissions by 45 percent in new 1988 model cars. The Canadian Government will further provide \$150 million in financial assistance to industry in its Federal-Provincial Acid Rain Program.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are in, the time to act is now. We need only look to West Germany to see what could happen to us if we wait too long. The West German Government's "1984 Forest Damage Survey" reports that in 1982 8 percent of its forests showed visible signs of damage. In 1983, the damage covered 34 percent of West German forestation, and by 1984 it covered a full 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this administration's indifference must stop. Appointing special envoys to do still more studies on this issue won't solve the problem. In fact, a senior administration official reiterated yesterday that the so-called agreement reached at the Shamrock Summit represents no change in the administration's position. Indeed Mr. Speaker, there was more blarney than shamrock in the summit meeting.

I stand here today to urge the President to reconsider his position on acid rain. Recently, Mr. Speaker, I introduced with 17 other Members of the New England delegation the toughest acid rain bill ever to be put before the Congress. H.R. 1030 mandates a 12-million-ton reduction in sulfur dioxide and a 4-million-ton reduction in nitrogen oxide. In addition, the bill provides for a unique State-by-State cost sharing program to help defray the costs of such a program. Mr. Speaker, we've made the called-for finance compromises in this bill; now let's see some real response from the administration before it's too late.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
THE POMPTON LAKES FIRST  
AID SQUAD, INC. OF NEW  
JERSEY UPON THE 50TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF ITS FOUNDING

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 23, the residents of Pompton Lakes and Riverdale in my congressional district, State of New Jersey, will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of their emergency first-aid medical services—the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad, Inc. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to the members of this most esteemed volunteer organization for their outstanding public service to our people.

At the outset let me commend to you the officers and members of the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad, Inc., whose standards of excellence in dedicated, unselfish service to the well-being of our people during the past half century have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the founding and organization of Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad, Inc., required the foresight, diligence and hard work of many, many people in devising a program and seeking full citizen participation and the benevolence of community leaders and distinguished citizens. With your permission, I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress a brief history of this dynamic and energetic squad of emergency medical technicians dedicated to accommodating the unexpected and tragic circumstances of illness and accidents that may befall our human resources. Its history is prefaced with the profound statement: " \* \* \* The entire sum of existence is the magic of being needed by just one person. \* \* \*" by Putnam and reads, as follows:

POMPTON LAKES AND RIVERDALE FIRST AID  
SQUAD

THE ENTIRE SUM OF EXISTENCE IS THE MAGIC  
OF BEING NEEDED BY JUST ONE PERSON

Early in the spring of 1935, a committee of seven men, recognizing the need for immediate ambulance service in our area, started the movement towards the purchase of an ambulance to be operated by trained First Aiders.

A donation of \$1,000 was received from a local resident to kick off a fund drive. An exhibition bout, given by Joe Louis, Heavyweight Champion of the World, who was in training in Pompton Lakes, realized an additional \$2,620, enabling the purchase of a new Packard ambulance in May 1935.

Drawing members from the area it would serve, the Squad was incorporated on June 10, 1935. The new ambulance was put into service on July 4, 1935 and since that time,

around the clock Emergency First Aid service has been provided.

The Squad headquarters is now located at the corner of Ramapo Avenue and Hershfield Park Place in Pompton Lakes.

Today the Squad serves the communities of Pompton Lakes and Riverdale. We are proud to be known as the 'Parent Squad' to the areas once served, Tri-Boro, Wayne, West Milford, Ringwood, Pequannock, Lincoln Park, Oakland and Wanaque, who as the need arose, formed their own Squads. We still count in our membership many residents of these same towns.

We have answered 38,050 calls for assistance since 1935. In the last ten years we have averaged 1,170 calls per year and traveled 187,000 miles, a distance equal to about seven trips around the world. In this, our first fifty years of existence, we have purchased 26 new ambulances and the latest in first aid equipment for the benefit of the communities we serve.

Our members must meet all State training requirements. All members are fully trained in Basic and Advanced First Aid, Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Mechanical Aids to Resuscitation, Emergency Childbirth, Extrication and Defensive Driving. A growing number of members have already qualified or are currently qualifying for certification as Emergency Medical Technicians.

We provide the following free services to all residents of Pompton Lakes and Riverdale, at home, in Hospitals, Convalescent Homes, Nursing Homes or other medical institutions, as well as visitors to our communities:

24 hour, 7 day per week, 365 day per year Emergency Medical Assistance and transportation.

Nonemergency ambulance transportation, when necessary, to and from Hospitals, Nursing Homes, Convalescent Homes and Doctors' offices, locally, to surrounding communities and, with sufficient notice, to almost anywhere in the Eastern United States; and

Use of Recuperative Equipment, including Hospital Beds, Wheel Chairs, Home Oxygen Units and Oxygen, Walkers, Canes and Crutches, for as long as is needed.

In addition, the Squad covers all local events and public affairs when requested, offers free lectures to local groups and civic organizations and conducts First Aid training for Boy and Girl Scouts, Police and Fire Departments, Municipal Employees and interested lay persons.

We look back on our many years of service with pride. We look ahead to our next Fifty Years with enthusiasm and confidence. We have come a long way since 1935 and know that the coming years will see a continuation of our dedication and growth for the welfare of the residents of Pompton Lakes and Riverdale.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to call this noteworthy event to your attention and seek national recognition of the unselfish dedicated public rescue and lifesaving efforts of the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad. As they celebrate the 50th Anniversary of their founding, let the record also show that we extend our Nation's deep appreciation and gratitude for the quality of their emergency medical services. We do indeed salute each and every member of the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad upon the celebration of their Golden Anniversary. Heartiest congratulations, fellow citizens.●

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED  
STATES OF AMERICA

**HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Girl Scouts of the United States of America celebrated its 73d anniversary with the theme "Reach Wider Still."

Juliette Gordon Low organized the first group of girls on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, GA. Since then, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America has become the largest voluntary organization for girls in the world.

Girl Scouting is a continuous adventure in learning that offers girls a broad range of activities which address both their current interests and their future roles as women. It is open to all girls ages 5 to 17—kindergarten through grade 12—who subscribe to the ideals as stated in the Girl Scout Promise and Law. There are approximately 3 million members in five program levels: Daisy Girl Scouts, age 5; Brownie Girl Scouts, ages 6 to 8; Junior Girl Scouts, ages 9 to 11, Cadette Girl Scouts, ages 12 to 14; and Senior Girl Scouts, ages 14 to 17.

On October 1, 1984, Girl Scout membership was extended to 5 year olds in the Daisy Girl Scouts. This is the latest in a series of changes over the past 10 years that have added a contemporary flavor to the Girl Scouts' traditional values. "It seemed a logical step for us and of critical importance for the American family. When you look at all the single-parent households, the Girl Scouts can be almost indispensable," said Frances Hesselbein, the Girl Scouts' national executive director.

In my home State of Kentucky, the Girl Scouts continue to be active. The Kentuckiana Girl Scout Council serves over 25,000 girls in the western part of Kentucky. During the past year the following members of the Council received the Girl Scout Gold Award, Girl Scouting's highest award: Ann Robertson, Debbie Culver, Beth Freibert, Susan Camillie Harned, Holly Hatfield, Tina Kenney, Kelley Mullaney, Sally Scott, Kellie Stark, Jennifer Starks, Carie Lynette Tur, Rosalind Whitlock, Karen Ann Baechle, Amy Boyd, Amy Chinn, Andrea Marie Wagner, and Frances Warnock.

I am proud of all the Girl Scouts in the Kentuckiana Girl Scout Council and I want to take this time to wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

## A FAIR OFFER ON NICARAGUA

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, although I don't agree with the administration's efforts to get \$14 million more for the Nicaraguan Contras, I do agree most strongly that recent suggestions for a cease-fire and exploratory talks between both sides under the auspices of the bishops is a legitimate offer made by the opponents of the Sandinistas. It should be pursued.

I echo the question asked in a recent Washington Post editorial—if anyone in Managua is listening—"Why not?"

This proposal could be a good first step to wind down the fighting and reach a "civilized solution" that the people of Nicaragua deserve.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1985]

## A FAIR OFFER TO THE SANDINISTAS

The Sandinistas claim the crisis in Nicaragua arises from their conflict with the United States. This is not so. It arises in the first instance from their conflict with their fellow citizens, especially with the democratic people who fought the Somoza dictatorship, whose leaders served the Sandinistas in the early period and who turned against the Sandinistas only when they found the democratic promise of the revolution being denied. This needs to be understood in order to see the importance of the offer the democrats have just made to the Managua regime.

The offer comes from a newly, finally unified group including the political opposition led by Arturo Cruz and major branches of the armed resistance. Its essence is a proposal for a unilateral cease-fire by the contras to be followed by a political dialogue presided over by the bishops. The proposal is, in our view, entirely fair and reasonable. The Sandinistas protest the war? Here is an offer to stop it. How must they pay? Only by joining a process that points to the original goals of their own revolution. Their own man, Daniel Ortega, can remain president as the process unfolds. The proposal offers more than a chance for national reconciliation. It lets Nicaraguans remove their fate from foreign hands and restore it to Nicaraguan hands alone.

The Sandinistas' initial response to the proposal was to bar Arturo Cruz from returning to Nicaragua to announce it and to summon some of its local supporters to state security headquarters on grounds that they were participating in a U.S.-sponsored plot to overthrow the Sandinista government. Think of it: An offer by the opposition to put down arms and to start talking about achieving the Sandinistas' own early promises is dismissed as a hostile conspiracy.

How do the Sandinistas intend to explain to the Nicaraguan people a refusal to enter a dialogue on such a reasonable basis? How can any other independent-minded Latin country—must that exclude Cuba?—fail to support this proposal? In El Salvador, the government accepted a dialogue without even getting a cease-fire in return. The government in Nicaragua is being offered a

better deal. Perhaps it will think again before delivering a final rejection.

And—the inevitable question—if the rejection is final? No doubt some will argue that the Sandinistas' failure to take the offer seriously makes American support of the contras unarguable. The drafters of the Nicaraguan opposition proposal, however, are shying away from that claim. Desperately, they are making a "last effort to grant to our country a civilized solution."●

## RECIDIVISM RATES DEMANDS SWIFT ACTION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following articles which appeared in the March 4, 1985, New York Times and the March 4, 1985, Washington Post respectively.

These articles highlight the results of a recent Bureau of Justice statistics study which revealed some startling statistics on recidivism rates at State prisons:

Almost 84 percent of arriving inmates at State prisons around the country in 1979 were repeat offenders;

Sixty-one percent had been imprisoned previously, and of these, nearly half would still have been incarcerated for earlier crimes had they served the maximum term to which they were sentenced.

The omnibus crime control legislation passed last Congress and signed into law abolishes parole for Federal crimes and a system of fixed sentences for Federal offenses will be established in late 1986. I hope, in light of the release of the Bureau of Justice statistics' study, that the provisions of the new omnibus Federal crime control law will be used as a model for swift enactment of parole, pardon, and sentencing changes for State offenses.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1985]

## EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT REPEAT OFFENDER RATE EXAMINED

(By Leslie Maitland Werner)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—Almost 84 percent of arriving inmates at state prisons around the country in 1979 were repeat offenders, according to a study conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and made public today.

The study reported that 61 percent had been imprisoned previously, and that 42 percent were on probation or parole for an earlier conviction at the time they entered prison. About 28 percent of those who entered prison would still have been jailed for an earlier offense had they served the maximum term to which they were sentenced.

The study involved interviews with a sample of inmates nationwide.

Another report on crime, released today by the Eisenhower Foundation, says that violence by young repeat offenders has become more frequent and more serious. It describes street crime as "a form of slow rioting" requiring social action in terms of

economic development, youth employment and community programs.

## DETERRENCE "DID NOT WORK"

The authors of this report, "American Violence and Public Policy," maintain that "deterrence during the 1970's through more efficient police, courts and prisons did not work, in part because these agencies can merely react to crime, not prevent it."

The study by the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Justice Department takes a different point of view, placing the emphasis on law enforcement. Assistant Attorney General Stephen S. Trott, who heads the department's Criminal Division, said the findings indicated how much crime could be reduced "If criminals actually served the increased sentences which could be imposed under present law."

"It is particularly disturbing," he said, "to see that about one-fourth of all the crimes committed by the prisoners studied were committed while they would have been in prison if they had served the maximum sentence."

Steven R. Schlesinger, director of the bureau, said the study raised "serious questions" about probation and parole decisions. But he said it was impossible to determine from the study how much crime might be avoided through sentencing policies.

## HE REJECTS THAT CONCLUSION

Lawrence A. Greenfeld, the statistician who wrote the report, rejected the idea that the figures indicated parole had been a failure. The study, he said at a briefing Friday, focused only on those who returned to prison. "Half did not return to prison," he said.

Parole for Federal crimes is scheduled to be abolished under the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984. Under the act, a system of fixed, or determinate, sentences for Federal offenses will be established in late 1986, eliminating parole for new offenders.

The study of state inmates showed that most repeat offenses occurred shortly after release from prison. About 60 percent of those who will return to prison in 20 years, it found, do so in the first three years.

Age was a significant factor in the rate of return to prison, according to the study, with the youngest released prisoners the most likely to commit new crimes. Almost 22 percent of those 18 to 24 years of age return to prison within a year of release. But that figure drops to 12 percent for the 25-to-34-year-old group; to 7 percent for those 35 to 44; and 2 percent for those older than 45.

Half of the youngest group were returned to prison within seven years, but only 12 percent of those in the oldest category, the study found.

The study also found that repeat offenders were much more likely than first-time offenders to have a family member who was imprisoned.

The general rate of imprisonment has been increasing throughout the country, the study said. In 1978, for example, there were 7.2 court commitments to prison for every 10,000 adults. But that figure climbed to 10.1 in 1983.

"The increased reliance on imprisonment is not simply a reflection of hardening public attitudes," it said. "It is also based upon the growing body of knowledge about criminal careers and the likelihood that many offenders will continue to commit crimes after they are released from prison."

## RATE IS THIRD HIGHEST

This increased rate is a subject also addressed in the Eisenhower Foundation study, which was financed by the Ford Foundation and published by Yale University Press. Among industrial countries, only South Africa and the Soviet Union have higher rates of imprisonment than the United States, the book says.

The study, by 12 authorities, is a 15-year updating of a 1969 report to the White House by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, known as the Eisenhower Commission. It was created by President Johnson after the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy. The Eisenhower Foundation is the re-creation in the private sector of the commission.

Lynn A. Curtis, president of the foundation, said, "The police are limited in what they can do to prevent crime."

"Inner city groups can organize their neighborhoods against crime because residents have a stake in their own turf," Dr. Curtis said. "Such crime prevention must be used not as an end, but as a means to secure the neighborhood for economic development, minority business, housing rehabilitation and minority youth employment. This addresses the cause of crime."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1985]  
STUDY OF STATE PRISONS FINDS RECIDIVISM  
RATES HIGH IN 1979  
(By Kathy Sawyer)

About four-fifths of the persons placed in state prisons during 1979 were repeat offenders, and 40 percent were on parole or probation when they went back behind bars, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported in the first nationwide study of its kind.

Nearly two-thirds of the group had been incarcerated previously as adults, juveniles or both, according to the study released yesterday. Of these, nearly half (46 percent) would still have been incarcerated for earlier crimes if they had served the maximum term of previous sentences. The study calls them "avertable recidivists."

Of those who had never been in prison, 60 percent had at least one previous conviction for a criminal offense.

"These findings raise serious questions about the impact of probation and parole decisions on public safety, and create a challenge for those who set sentences and shape sentencing policy," bureau director Steven R. Schlesinger said in a statement accompanying the report. The bureau is a Justice Department agency.

The report is based on interviews with a nationwide sample of 5,357 inmates, representing 153,000 men admitted to state prisons in 1979. Previous studies of repeat offenders in prison have focused on individual communities and relied primarily on police records rather than on interviews with offenders, officials said.

## Among other findings:

Half the inmates released from state prisons return within 20 years, with most within the first to third year.

Offenders committing robberies, burglaries or auto thefts were returning more rapidly than those committing violent crimes such as murder, rape and assault.

The younger the prisoners were at release, the higher the rate of those returning within the first year. Of those between ages 18 and 24 upon release, 22 percent returned to prison within a year. The percentage of returnees dropped sharply for those older than that group.

Half of the repeat offenders had four or more prior sentences of probation, jail or prison. About one in nine had more than 10 prior convictions.

The report is not an attack on parole and probation, bureau officials said.

The study underlines the logic of the justice system," said Lawrence Greenfeld, director of correctional statistics. "To get to prison as a first timer, you have to commit a very serious crime. Conversely, to get to prison with a less serious offense, you are likely to be a recidivist."

The findings have implications for early-release programs around the country, he said. "It may be that the people being released [often those classified as nonviolent] are those most likely to be coming right back in again . . . We need to know more about behavior and what characteristics are linked to early failure."

An update of a second study by 12 prominent university experts found that violence in America has risen since the group's 1969 study, Reuter reported.

"The federal government's policy of deterrence during the 1970's, through more efficient police hardware and more efficient police, courts and prisons, simply did not work," said the report by a White House commission chaired by Milton Eisenhower.

The level of crime in the United States remains astronomical when compared with that of other industrialized democracies," it said.●

THE QUEENS JEWISH CENTER  
HONORS RUTH AND LEON  
WILDES AT ITS 42D ANNUAL  
DINNER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to extend warm congratulations to Rabbi Joseph Grunblat and to the entire membership of the Queens Jewish Center on the occasion of its 42d annual dinner, on Sunday, March 17, 1985.

In addition to marking yet another milestone in the history of this synagogue, the event will also pay tribute to Ruth and Leon Wildes, devoted members and builders of the Queens Jewish Center. Their exemplary leadership and commitment, both within the congregation and beyond, have earned them the esteem and respect of the entire community.

As a past president and chairman of the board of the Queens Jewish Center, Leon Wildes was instrumental in establishing this outstanding institution as an active center of learning and worship, responsive to the ever-increasing spiritual and cultural needs of the thriving Jewish community of Forest Hills, NY.

Similarly, Ruth Wildes has contributed immeasurably to strengthening and furthering the ideals and values that have become the cornerstones of this congregation, which her father helped found.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, permit me to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the benevolence and generosity of my friend, Leon Wildes. Less than 2 years ago, when I was called upon to intercede on behalf of two Iranian Jewish brothers who sought asylum in our country, I was privileged to join forces with Mr. Wildes in helping them realize their dream. As a noted attorney specializing in immigration law, Mr. Wildes displayed the highest level of concern and compassion in protecting the rights of these young men, and secured for them the freedom they so desperately desired.

Mr. Wildes has been the champion of human rights in numerous immigration cases. He successfully fought Nixon administration officials who were trying to deport former Beatle John Lennon, and won this celebrated case in 1976, after 5-year battle. Years later, he learned that the officials had attempted to deport Lennon as a political vendetta because of the former Beatle's anti-Vietnam War stance. During the Iranian revolution, Mr. Wildes obtained visas for more than 300 Iranian students seeking asylum in the United States. His brilliance and humanitarianism have saved the lives of scores of people facing uncertainty or death abroad.

Thus, it is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to call upon my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the United States to join me in saluting the accomplishments of the Queens Jewish Center, and its distinguished spiritual leader, Rabbi Joseph Grunblat, and to wish a hearty mazal tov to Ruth and Leon Wildes, who have deservedly been chosen as guests of honor for this happy occasion.●

AMUSEMENT PARK SAFETY ACT

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 1596.

Both political parties have spent a substantial amount of time lately discussing what have come to be known as pro-family issues. The issue before us is certainly pro-family.

In my view, American families have the right to know that when they put a youngster on an amusement ride, the ride isn't going to end in tragedy. Unfortunately, facts show that not to be the case.

An average of 10,000 people a year are injured on the midway. These injuries include disfigurement, paralysis, and amputation. In the last 11 years, 103 people have also died on rides that were supposed to be safe and fun.

That doesn't sound like a lot of fun to me and I think we owe our fellow citizens, especially our children, more than that.

In the 97th Congress, I introduced an amendment that would restore authorization to the Consumer Product Safety Commission to inspect fixed site amusement rides. My amendment made it through the Energy and Commerce Committee and it died right here. In the 98th Congress, a similar measure was introduced by our colleague, Senator PAUL SIMON, when he was a Member of this body. Senator SIMON's measure made it through the committee and the House but it died in the Senate. With each delay in passing this legislation, more American families have suffered the tragic consequences of amusement ride accidents.

There has been a lot of discussion by the amusement park industry that they can regulate themselves. But what explanation can the industry offer in the case of a ride called the Enterprise?

The Enterprise had been a fixed-site ride in New York and then was shipped across the country to the Texas State Fair where a fatal accident occurred on the ride.

The CPSC inspected the ride to determine the probable cause of the accident. The inspection revealed structural and design flaws common to the Enterprise. Yet the Commission could not require the upgrading of the safety features on 12 Enterprise rides around the country because it lacked jurisdiction over fixed-site rides.

The Commission inspectors had found a problem that could be remedied, but were powerless to do anything about it. So too are the people who board these rides in search of safe thrills. Let's not leave them powerless.

Consumer protection in this country has to consist of more than just sending injured people and widows and orphans off to take up their concerns with their insurance companies.

This is a modest bill. It is respectful of those States that already have safety inspection programs. The Commission's inspectors would have the authority to inspect in those States only when an accident resulted in serious injury or death. In the meantime, the 28 States that have no safety inspection programs would be covered under CPSC jurisdiction. This bill does not give the CPSC the authority to write standards.

What this bill means is that while we protect American families, there will be no extra paperwork and red-tape for the amusement park industry, the vast majority of which are good, decent business people who provide a safe product to our communities. What this bill does is grant the CPSC the same jurisdiction under section 15 that it has for all other products, in-

cluding toys, thermostat control valves, toaster ovens, and the like. The Commission employs competent mechanical, electrical, and structural engineers who have the requisite experience to handle amusement park hazards.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to stand up for families and support this bill. Let's not let history be tragically repeated in the 99th Congress. American families shouldn't have to wait any longer for safe amusement rides.●

RABBI ARTHUR HERTZBERG  
HONORED

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg of Temple Emanuel in Englewood, NJ. On March 19, 1985, Rabbi Hertzberg will be honored with a testimonial dinner on the occasion of his retirement. He has served the synagogue for 29 years and will now become a rabbi emeritus.

Rabbi Hertzberg will be leaving the staff of Columbia University, where he is presently a professor of history, to become professor of religion at Dartmouth College. A renowned scholar, he has written several books on Judaism as well as having contributed to Foreign Affairs magazine. He has served as vice president of the World Jewish Congress, president of the American Jewish Congress and, presently, as president of the American Jewish Policy Foundation.

Throughout the years Rabbi Hertzberg has been a respected and revered leader. He has committed himself to service to his community and service to his fellow mankind. During those years he has brought new spirit and growth to his congregation and new prosperity to his synagogue.

I am proud to join his wife Phyllis, and daughters Susan and Linda, in the celebration of a lifetime devoted to the ideals of brotherhood, faith, and humanity. I applaud his many achievements and wish him a retirement filled with good health and prosperity.●

A SALUTE TO EDWARD J. BALTARZUK, POLONIANS "MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, March 22, a devoted friend and constituent, Edward J. Bal-

tarzuk, of Jersey City, is being honored as "Man of the Year" by the Polonians, Inc., a leading American-Polish organization of New Jersey.

Edward Baltarzuk has given a lifetime of community service. He has been in the forefront of every venture of good will, developing pride and community responsibility, aiding many worthy causes.

Ed is an individual with fierce pride in his view on Americanism. Equally, he speaks proudly of the Polish heritage of his parents.

On Friday evening he will be honored at the Wayne Manor in New Jersey for his work as a member of the Jersey City Cultural Arts Commission and other community ventures.

Commissioner Edward J. Baltarzuk was selected as this year's Polonian of the Year because of his dedication to American-Polish causes and civil causes in Jersey City and Hudson County.

Born and raised in Jersey City, our honoree lives with his wife, the former Dorothy Kocot, also a native of Jersey City. They are the parents of two daughters, Katherine Midilli, whose husband is Dr. John Midilli, and daughter, Alexandra. Ed is grandfather of Christopher and Carlton Midilli.

Commissioner Baltarzuk attended St. Ann's Polish Parochial School and Dickinson High School.

A former employee of American Can Co., Ed is very active in civic activities in Jersey City.

Some of the activities Commissioner Baltarzuk is involved in are: Aide to Gerald McCann, mayor of Jersey City; member of the Jersey City Cultural Arts Commission; member of the Jersey City Planning Board 1970-80; vice president, General Pulaski Memorial Committee; vice president, Polonians, Inc., member of the Jersey City Bicentennial Commission, 1973-76; chairman, Jersey City Polish Constitution Day 1978 to 1980; Jersey City marshal, Pulaski Day Parade 1976; chairman, Jersey City Committee to aid refugees from Polish martial law 1981.

Organized first American Solidarity Day rally, December 31, 1981, Liberty State Park.

Accompanied Stanley Walesa, father of Lech Walesa, on fund raising tour for Solidarity 1981; delivered greetings to Lech Walesa in Gdansk on behalf of Mayor Gerald McCann, of Jersey City, on the occasion of the Nobel Peace Prize Award.

Organized Polka Festival Tribute to Solidarity at Liberty State Park 1981.

Presided at a benefit concert at St. Peter's College, Jersey City to raise funds for the family of Jaroslaw Zastrozny; director, Mayor's Action Bureau, Jersey City 1977-82;

Coordinated Annual Mayor's Pilgrimages to Statue of Liberty 1976-85; coordinated free concerts for Senior Citizens centers, hospitals and nursing homes 1980-85.

In October 1983, Ed Baltarzuk served as my ambassador without portfolio delivering a message to the great Lech Walesa, in Gdansk, Poland. In that message, Ed brought my nomination over the 3 previous years to Nobel Peace Prize Commission to name Lech Walesa for that prestigious award.

Baltarzuk and his lively wife, Dorothy, met with Lech Walesa on October 19, 1983. They presented him with a copy of my testimony before the Congress of the United States regarding the Nobel Peace Prize and copies of the Jersey Journal announcement.

At that time Walesa gave Ed a message in Polish to deliver to me, which was:

Free people of the world are our brothers, Walesa told Baltarzuk in Polish.

I have struggled for human rights and it is just as important to fight for human rights as to win.

Regarding the Nobel prize, Walesa said;

The prize does not belong to me but to the valiant and gallant people of Poland.

In the message Ed Baltarzuk delivered for me to Walesa I expressed appreciation for Mr. Walesa's letter to me which I consider to be of such historic significance that I wish to share it herein:

I KRAJOWY ZJAZD DELEGATOW NSZZ-SOLIDARNOSC

Gdansk, 7th October 1981, Frank J. Guarini, 14th District, New Jersey. Dear Mr. Guarini, Thank you very much for your cordial letter and tribute you paid to me but first of all I am happy to hear that you approve the activities of our independent, self-governed union.

All of us are very grateful for the moral support of aims and tasks we declared and which must be of concern to all who are interested in justice.

Thanks to your letter and many others from the U.S.A. and all over the world our union is becoming stronger and aware that in our struggle for human rights and dignity we are not alone. It is the source of hope for us that these aims should be achieved not in Poland only but also in other countries.

I am absolutely convinced that the proposal of mutual cooperation you suggested and I accept with great pleasure will service the cause of peace, justice, and freedom for all the people.

I hope that my visit to the U.S.A. will help to achieve our aims.

I am grateful, Sir that you supported my nomination for the 1981 Nobel Peace Prize. This is a matter of great importance, particularly for the whole of "Solidarity" as the union, much more than for me personally.

Thank you for the American flag and the photos you enclosed.

I extend our best wishes for you and all the "Solidarity's" friends in the U.S.A., I remain, Sincerely, Lech Walesa, Chairman of NSZZ "Solidarnosc"

Ed Baltarzuk loves his family, he loves his community, he loves life. He is a gregarious man of many talents. He finds time for another one of his loves—that of the international language—making music. He is an excellent performer and has provided thousands of hours of enjoyment.

Ed is leading a full life, building friendships, indicating his gratitude to those who have helped him spread hope and happiness with his many volunteer efforts.

Ed has obtained life's biggest reward—that of contentment, which is best described by Oscar Wilde, who said:

Contentment lies not in the enjoyment of ease—a life of luxury—but comes only to him that labors and overcomes—to him that performs the task in hand and reaps the satisfaction of work well done.

I commend the Polonians for their selection of Ed Baltarzuk as their "Man of the Year." He indeed is a patriotic friend and public servant extraordinaire.

Ed echoes the adage that "The true worth of a man is to be measured by the object he pursues." Indeed his heart is as great as the world and there is no room in it to hold the memory of a wrong.

May our society be blessed with the dedication of many many years to come.●

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] on its 20th anniversary of valuable service to the Appalachian region of this country. Since its inception in 1965, this unique Federal-State-local program has significantly contributed to the various areas of local development in my congressional district, not to mention to the whole of Appalachia.

The Appalachian Highway Program, in particular, has been critically important to the upstate New York area and has been instrumental in the construction of the Southern Tier Expressway, the only four-lane, limited access highway linking our economically depressed rural region with the Interstate System. Travel time from certain points in upstate New York to New York City has already been reduced from 10 hours to 7 hours, and the Southern Tier Expressway has not yet been completed. I am sure that my colleagues can appreciate the importance of this development and the need to complete this highway project.

In addition to contributing to highway development, much progress has been made in the areas of vocational training, health care delivery, child development, community development, energy and enterprise development, and housing in my district, and in the rest of the Appalachian region. For example, the James Prendergast Library in Jamestown and the Steele Memorial Library in Elmira, two of the most important information centers in my district, were built with ARC library funds. In Steuben County, the regional business development center sponsored by the Corning Community College whose graduates have made significant contributions to the economy of the region was started with ARC vocational education funds. In the field of health, the burn and rehabilitation unit at St. Joseph's Hospital in Elmira was started with \$200,000 in ARC funds, and the development of rural ambulatory care at the Salamanca Hospital in Cattaraugus County was assisted with over \$300,000 in these funds. I could go on and on with examples of how my congressional district has benefited from ARC funding, but I think that my point is clear. The ARC's contribution to the 14 New York counties has been invaluable and the future of the ARC is of great concern to me.

The 13 Appalachian Governors' 1986 budget request for ARC is \$311,100,000. This is consistent with the Governors' finish-up proposal submitted to Congress in 1981 and with the authorization passed by the House last session. Also, it is consistent with a resolution adopted by the National Governors' Association at its recent meeting. That resolution, in endorsing the concept of multistate regional development strategies and programs, states specifically: "The administration and Congress should give full financial support to the Governors' plan to provide for phase-out funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission." This budget request includes \$234 million for the Appalachian Highway and Access Road Program so that the task of completing the most essential segments of the revised highway plan, such as the Southern Tier Expressway can be completed. I believe that the Governors' 1983-85 record in managing the ARC finish-up program which was worked out with Congress justifies the request for funds in 1986.

The administration is proposing the termination of the Commission—both the highway and nonhighway programs—at the end of 1985. No funds for 1986 have been included in the President's budget. The administration also proposes to rescind \$99 million of the \$149 million program appropriation in 1985, including \$56 million from highways, \$39 million from

area development programs and \$4 million from the local development district and technical assistance program. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this proposal to gut the sensible phase-out of the ARC Program, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in opposing the President's request and will support instead the Appalachian Governors' request for 1986.

It is very important that the Congress rallies behind the ARC this year. I hope that I have been able to outline the valuable contributions of the ARC to northern Appalachia, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the President's request to eliminate the program. For 20 years, the ARC has made a positive difference in the lives of people in one of the poorest segments of our Nation and I strongly believe that we should continue to fund this Commission until the projects that have been started such as the Southern Tier Expressway be given a reasonable level of support so that they may be completed. Not to do so would be to "pull the rug out from under" our region, and would to some degree dampen the growth that we have seen in Appalachia over the last 20 years. Again, I say congratulations to the ARC on its 20th anniversary and all of America should be proud of a job well done.●

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE TAXES ON GASOLINE

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to reduce the Federal deficit and lessen our Nation's dependence on imported oil by imposing an additional tax on gasoline. This bill would increase U.S. Treasury revenues by \$135 billion over the next 5 years and, at the same time, would significantly improve our Nation's energy security.

The bill I am introducing would impose a phased-in excise tax on gasoline and other motor fuels including diesel fuel and gasohol. The tax would start at 10 cents a gallon the first year and increase by 10 cents each year until it reaches 50 cents a gallon 5 years after enactment. From the fifth year on, the tax would remain at 50 cents a gallon. Phasing in the tax by 10 cents a year is intended to help cushion its inflationary impact and allow time to plan for the increases.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that each additional cent-per-gallon tax imposed on gasoline and diesel fuel will yield roughly \$900 million a year. At that rate, this bill would raise \$9 billion the first year and an additional \$9 billion each successive year, for a total of \$135 billion

over 5 years. Each year from the fifth year on, this tax would produce \$45 billion annually. Unlike the existing 9-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, which is earmarked for highways and mass transit, this tax would be a general revenue measure.

The revenue that would be raised from this tax would result in a sizable reduction in the deficit. But, equally important, because this tax would lead to reduce gasoline consumption, it would help us build a more secure energy future.

Although oil imports have decreased in recent years, we still import more than one-quarter of the oil we use. That large volume of imported oil not only keeps us dangerously dependent on foreign sources of energy, but also contributes to the enormous deficit in our balance of trade. Both of these trends seriously threaten the future stability of our Nation's economy and our security.

Much of the oil we import comes from the politically unstable Middle East. All of the oil which moves through the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz is at risk because of the continuing war between Iran and Iraq. Even if our own oil supply is not curtailed in a crisis, we would be directly affected by an oil cutoff to our allies because of our agreement through the International Energy Agency which requires us to share our supplies in the event of a serious oil supply disruption. The result of such a disruption, therefore, would be shortages at home, with the inevitable gas lines and increased prices.

Even if a supply disruption never occurs, we are still headed toward paying significantly higher prices for oil in the future. The current decline in oil prices, which appears to be inducing lax attitudes about gasoline conservation and dampening the demand for more fuel-efficient automobiles, is likely to result in a return to our gas-guzzling ways of the past. Because oil supplies are not expected to be so abundant in the 1990's as they are now, the inevitable result of higher gasoline consumption will be higher prices for imported oil in the future.

Rather than letting ourselves be victimized by future oil price hikes, we should begin gradually increasing the price of gasoline—paying the extra cost to ourselves, now, instead of to foreign oil producers in the future. An additional gasoline tax, which will help maintain efforts to conserve oil, will lead to lower oil consumption and, as a result, more stability in oil supplies and prices for years to come.

Most other industrialized nations imposed hefty gasoline taxes on themselves years ago in an effort to reduce their oil consumption. Japan, West Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, and the Netherlands all have gasoline

taxes ranging from 88 cents to \$1.69 a gallon. Under this proposed tax, even at its full amount of 50 cents a gallon—combined with the existing 9 cents a gallon Federal gasoline tax and State and local gasoline taxes—which range from 5 to 18 cents a gallon—Americans would still be paying significantly less in gasoline taxes than the citizens of most other industrialized nations.

Now is an ideal time to impose a 5-year, 10-cents-a-year increase in the Federal tax on gasoline. Because prices have declined and are expected to continue to fall or at least stabilize through the remainder of this decade, the tax would impose only a relatively minor burden on motorists. In fact, for the first year or two that the new tax is in effect, gasoline prices would be no higher than they have been without the tax in recent years. Even if gasoline prices do not fall further, motorists would not have to pay a full 50 cents more than they have already paid for a gallon of gasoline. It is unlikely that we will ever again have an opportunity to impose a substantial tax on gasoline at so little cost to ourselves.

No one likes the idea of imposing higher taxes on any sort, but it is clear that Congress is going to have to raise some revenues in order to bring under control the \$200 billion annual deficits which will be with us for the foreseeable future. Since additional taxes are inevitable, we should consider carefully the kinds of policies that any new taxes will promote. A gradual but substantial new gasoline tax is a relatively simple and very effective way of promoting a sensible national policy while raising revenues necessary to keep our budget deficit manageable. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this tax.●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JOHN DONNELLY

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the time of year when we celebrate St. Patrick's Day is a fitting time indeed to honor the memory of John Donnelly, an eminently friendly son of St. Patrick and a fine gentleman who passed from our midst recently, and who had a wealth of friends not only in the Binghamton and Broome County area of my district, but in the Nation's Capital area as well.

People who follow politics in New York will remember John as the Broome County Democratic Chairman for 13 years, during the late 1940's and 1950's. New Yorkers familiar with Government will also remember him

as a young man who, 2 years after graduating from Notre Dame University, spent the 6 years from 1936 through 1942 as area supervisor of the National Youth Administration, headed at the national level by a youthful Lyndon B. Johnson. Years later, when Johnson ran for President, Donnelly unhesitatingly supported him, somewhat to the discomfiture of those area Democrats who were backing John Kennedy. The happy outcome of that courageous stand by John Donnelly was that, when Johnson soon afterward became Vice President-elect, he brought Donnelly to Washington for the first of a series of Federal positions that were to keep John in the Washington area for the rest of his life. After brief employment in the Senate, he served as Assistant Commissioner for Congressional Liaison of the Federal Housing Administration; from 1964 until his retirement, he worked in the Navy's Congressional Liaison Office as an Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

John Donnelly was a native of New York's Broome County and spent some of the most exciting years of his life there. But he was also an adopted Washingtonian for the last half of his life, until his death late last month; and it was here in the U.S. Capitol that he spent much of his life in Federal service. Whenever Irish eyes are smiling, whether in Broome County or in Washington, many people will warmly remember how John Donnelly graced their lives, and will miss him.●

#### VERMONTERS CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP ON BUDGET AND ECONOMY

**HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, in January I mailed to constituents my 11th annual Vermont questionnaire. The survey covered the wide range of economic and budgetary issues which are now before Congress. The results, which have just been tabulated, should be of interest to my colleagues.

The questionnaire was filled out by 6,167 Vermont adults; a lower response rate than in previous years. I can only speculate on the reason. But the Vermont public may be reacting to the issues the way many of us are. The problems we face do not lend themselves to simple, painless answers. We all become less effusive in expressing views when the best answers all have drawbacks.

Yet the respondents do constitute a very large cross section of Vermonters, who demonstrated keen insights into the issues we face.

If there is one overriding message, it is a demand for leadership in this Congress. A large majority has indicated dissatisfaction with the status quo, and, by implication, appreciation for the challenges placed before us by President Reagan. But relatively few want us to simply say "yes" or "no" to the President's proposals. They want us to act, not just react.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

The first question asked for Vermonters overall views on the general features of the President's program:

1. President Reagan's general approach is to cut taxes, increase defense spending, and reduce federal domestic spending. Of the following statements, please check the one which is closest to your opinion.

A. The President's approach as described above should be adopted with no revisions. 13 percent agreed.

B. Defense spending should be boosted but at a slower rate; social programs should be reviewed for further cuts or shifts to the states. Taxes should then be raised if necessary to balance the budget. 6 percent agreed.

C. Spending should be frozen in all possible areas, including defense, Social Security, veterans' benefits, civil service pay, and revenue sharing. For programs that cannot be frozen, such as Medicare and student loans, benefits should be reduced for middle and higher income people. Taxes should then be raised if necessary to balance the budget. 34 percent agreed.

D. Defense spending should be substantially reduced. Social programs should not be substantively cut or transferred to the states. Tax increases should make up the difference. 39 percent agreed.

E. The same as (D) above, *except* that it is not necessary to balance the budget; only reduce the deficit as much as possible without significant reductions in social programs. 8 percent agreed.

If you combine (D) and (E), 47 percent indicated in general terms that budget cuts for deficit reduction should occur primarily on the military side of the budget, rather than domestic services. Another 34 percent (C) felt that both domestic and military spending should be frozen to the extent practicable.

By combining (B), (C) and (D), 79 percent indicated willingness to pay more taxes if necessary, as part of a larger effort to bring the Federal budget under control.

#### DEFENSE SPENDING

The second question requested views specifically on the appropriate level of defense spending:

2. Defense outlays have risen from \$159.8 billion to an estimated \$272 billion in four years. After adjusting for inflation, the increase is about 38%. Defense is now 7% of the Gross National Product; a higher percentage than in the 1970's, but lower than in the '50's and '60's. Please check the one statement closest to your views on this issue.

Defense spending should be:

A. Reduced. 46 percent agreed.

B. Frozen at present levels. 16 percent agreed.

C. Increased only at the rate of economic growth, about 3 or 4% in real dollars. 33 percent agreed.

D. Continued to be increased at a high rate. 5 percent agreed.

These numbers have little need for interpretation. It is clear that a very large majority of Vermonters believes our defense needs can be met without the continued dramatic increases proposed by the administration.

#### REDUCING PROGRAMS

At the same time, many Vermonters made it clear they are willing to accept budget cuts in a number of programs in order to reduce the deficit:

3. In our efforts to bring the budget under control, which if any of the following programs do you feel should be reduced?

A. Aid to public education. 13 percent agreed to reductions.

B. Grants and loans to college students. 26 percent agreed.

C. Foreign economic aid. 60 percent agreed.

D. Foreign military aid. 81 percent agreed.

E. Social Security. 10 percent agreed.

F. Veterans' benefits. 17 percent agreed.

G. Food Stamps. 26 percent agreed.

H. Job training. 16 percent agreed.

I. Military and Civil Service Retirement. 49 percent agreed.

J. Aid to Needy Families with Children. 11 percent agreed.

K. SSI for elderly, blind and disabled. 3 percent agreed.

L. Women Infants and Children program. 15 percent agreed.

M. Low Income Energy Assistance. 15 percent agreed.

N. Civil Service Salaries. 51 percent agreed.

#### ELIMINATING PROGRAMS

Very few Vermonters called for wholesale elimination of programs. They did, however, provide guidance as to which programs we should consider eliminating if necessary to bring the budget under control. Some of my colleagues may be impressed that these judgments were not based on self-interest. Many said support of Amtrak could be phased out, even though this would mean the end of rail passenger service in Vermont. We all use the Post Office, but many agreed with ending subsidies. The minority agreeing with phaseout of dairy supports, in our dairy State, was nearly as large as the number suggesting an end to other farm supports:

4. During budget preparations, members of the Administration have suggested eliminating or phasing out funding for the following programs. Check those which you feel should receive no federal money.

A. Amtrak. 43 percent agreed.

B. Dairy Price Supports. 30 percent.

C. Farm Supports Other Than Dairy. 38 percent.

D. Small Business Administration Loans. 16 percent.

E. Electric subsidies to western states. 68 percent.

F. Revenue sharing (towns and cities). 17 percent.

G. Sewer and water grants to towns. 16 percent.

H. Rural electric subsidies. 29 percent.

- I. Farm ownership loans. 12 percent.
- J. Weatherization assistance. 30 percent.
- K. Postal subsidies. 61 percent.
- L. Job Corps. 23 percent.

**MEDICARE**

A very large majority of Vermonters wants Congress to make the tough decisions needed to shore up the Medicare trust fund:

5. Medicare now costs \$70.2 billion, up from \$42.5 billion in 1981. Without revisions, projections are that the trust fund could run dry in ten years. Of the following steps, which do you feel should be considered?

A. Require higher income recipients to pay a larger share of their own medical costs. 67 percent agreed.

B. Take more aggressive steps to hold down medical costs. 81 percent agreed.

C. Exclude from coverage expensive medical procedures which may only briefly prolong the lives of terminally ill patients. 55 percent agreed.

D. None of the above. Regardless of the cost, we must maintain all of the protections now available through Medicare. 5 percent agreed.

**PERSONAL AND CORPORATE TAXES**

Questions 6 and 7 asked, quite simply, whether personal income taxes should be raised as part of our attack on the deficit, and whether corporations should pay a larger share of the Federal tax burden.

A total of 44 percent said personal income taxes should be increased. This is lower than the 79 percent who, in question 1, expressed general agreement with various budget balancing packages which include tax increases among other steps. I think it's pretty clear that a great many Vermonters, while recognizing the necessity of dealing with the deficit, believe we should pursue every other reasonable step to bring our fiscal house into order before we even discuss whether any increase in personal income taxes is needed.

Corporate taxation is another story. There is a strong perception that we have opened up loopholes which allow too many corporations to escape paying their fair share of the burden. A large majority, 88 percent, said corporations should pay a larger share.

**TAX REFORM**

Apart from the issue of tax levels, there is strong support for tax reform. An overwhelming majority supported simplification of the Tax Code. The largest numbers urged a modified flat tax with progressive brackets and fewer deductions than we have now:

8. The tax code has been used both to raise money and to encourage certain conduct, such as giving to charity or buying a home. Many feel the system is too complicated, and should be simplified. Many also feel the tax code should favor some conduct. Of the statements below, please check the one closest to your views.

The present system should be:

A. Replaced by a single flat tax rate on all income over a minimal poverty level, with no deductions. 13 percent agreed.

B. Replaced by a single flat tax with fewer deductions than there are now. 10 percent agreed.

C. Replaced by a modified flat tax, with 3 or 4 brackets so that higher income people will pay higher rates, with fewer deductions than there are now. 55 percent agreed.

D. Kept in its present form, but with some of the loopholes and deductions removed. 19 percent agreed.

E. Left unchanged; the tax revisions of 1981 and subsequent years were sufficient. 4 percent agreed.

Finally, a key issue in any tax simplification plan is which, if any, deductions should be maintained. I'm certain my colleagues will be interested in the response of the Vermont public to that issue:

9. Please indicate which, if any, of the items below you feel should be deductible from federal income taxes.

A. Charitable contributions. 60 percent agreed.

B. Medical Expenses. 60 percent.

C. Home mortgage interest. 63 percent.

D. All interest payments. 32 percent.

E. State and local taxes. 61 percent.

F. Contributions to IRA's. 46 percent.

G. Political contributions. 10 percent.

H. Expenditures on solar energy. 24 percent.

I. Social Security benefits. 44 percent.

J. Savings for college or job training. 23 percent.

K. There should be no deductions. 17 percent.

**THE VALUE OF A QUESTIONNAIRE**

Obviously, if a questionnaire is to be useful, its limitations must be recognized.

A survey is not a substitute for letters, personal comments, or other forms of constituent communication. It cannot capture all shades or combinations of opinion, personal insights, or intensity of need. Questionnaire responses are like our votes on bills: We may not be particularly pleased with any of the options presented to us, but choose the ones closest to our views.

As long as that is understood, the questionnaire is an extremely valuable supplement to other forms of communication. It provides an opportunity for an extremely large cross section of Vermonters to comment on the same range of issues.

Obviously, all of our votes are based on personal conscience and the best available information. There are times when the best decision is not the most popular. But when we weigh issues, it is essential to listen closely to the people we represent.

The decisions we make this year may re-define the role of the Federal Government—and have significant impact on the lives of all Americans—for decades to come. The 11th Annual Vermont Questionnaire is an invaluable guide to the needs, views, and desires of the people I represent in making those decisions.●

**ANNUAL FOUNDERS DAY OBSERVED BY KAPPA ALPHA PSI FRATERNITY**

**HON. DALE E. KILDEE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of my colleagues the observance of Annual Founders Day by the Flint Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., was founded in Indiana in 1911. Its fundamental purpose is achievement by its members. The Flint Chapter was founded March 15, 1947, when U.S. Bagley, Attorney Joseph Birch, Albert Harper, Dr. J.L. Leach, John Russell, Attorney Elisha Scott, John Tyiska, Dr. C.E. Waldren, Dr. Wrex Weaver, Attorney J.F. Young, and Kenneth Young petitioned the fraternity's national headquarters in Philadelphia and were granted a charter.

On March 16, 1985, the chapter held its Annual Founders Day Dinner. Dr. Clinton Jones, a member of the fraternity and chancellor of the University of Michigan-Flint, delivered the address entitled "Achievement Since 1911." Each year the fraternity presents a leadership award to the member who exerts himself in an extraordinary manner in the community as well as in the fraternity. This year there were two recipients. They are Gary Burks, a probation officer in the 68th district court, and Chester Hughes, the chapter Polemarch, president, and principal at Beecher Summit Middle School.

The Flint Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., does commendable work in the Flint community in building and improving quality of life for all. I am pleased to bring this recognition of the services of its members to the attention of the Congress.●

**THE FED ROLE IN THE FARM CRISIS**

**HON. JIM COURTER**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress must face up to the reality that these bailouts—whether for farmers, Continental Illinois or Third World debtors—are really the last line of defense against the Fed-induced credit crunch and worldwide dollar shortage.

Since the Fed's publicly announced credit squeeze began in early 1984, spot commodity prices have fallen 21 percent, industrial commodities are

down 17 percent, grain prices are down 10 percent, and farm prices are down 7 percent. Interest rates began falling slightly from September through February but Fed Chairman Paul Volcker now says the ease has ended. This is shocking news for farmers of north-west New Jersey, as well as the rest of the country.

We have had to relearn a fundamental monetary axiom in the 1980's that deflation is just as pernicious as inflation. A rising dollar is no more desirable than a falling dollar. Farmers have been the first to learn this lesson, and only too well.

Congress must pass a growth-oriented Fed reform bill, such as the Kemp-Lott Balanced Monetary Policy and Price Stability Act, which would halt the free rise of the dollar and the free fall of commodity prices in their tracks. A monetary policy that stabilizes prices and exchange rates is the progressive solution America's whip-sawed farmers are seeking.

By stabilizing the value of the dollar in terms of commodity prices and foreign currencies, as the Kemp-Lott bill would mandate, the Fed can move away from the policy of restraining the money supply one month and, without warning, restraining growth in the economy the next. These arbitrary, austerity prescriptions, which hold interest rates artificially high, are keeping unemployment at levels normally associated with a recession, and preventing real growth from reaching the Farm Belt.

The nondebate over the Fed's central role in the farm crisis reminds me of the proverb about the group of men, huddled under a street lamp in the middle of the night, looking for the dime one of them lost. "Where was the dime dropped?" a passerby asked. They answered by pointing down the dark alley. But why were they looking under the street lamp? "Because that is where the light is," they replied.

The Federal Reserve is down that dark alley, and it is long past time that we in Congress turned on the floodlight. What good has it been to call Chairman Volcker before a myriad of congressional committees when the main topic of discussion is fiscal policy, and his monetary policies and rationales change as often as the weather? There is no long-term guideline or rule on which the Fed bases policy; only the arbitrary intellectual and political whims of an unaccountable chairman and his secretive Open Market Committee.

The morality of forcing family farmers out of business by deflating farm values must be raised. Yet Chairman Volcker's only response to illiquidity in the Farm Belt is to say he can foresee no policy change that could keep many farmers, rural banks, and businesses from failing. This answer is un-

acceptable, and it is time for the Congress and the administration to repudiate and change the Fed's misguided policies.●

#### THE MX MISSILE IS INEFFECTIVE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. William Colby, recently sent a letter to every Member of this body urging us to reject the MX missile because it is "ineffective," "dangerous," and "not a bargaining chip."

Let me highlight two points Mr. Colby makes that I believe are very important, but often overlooked. He states, "The test of need for a weapon is whether it accomplishes its mission without counterproductive effects, not whether it is the same weapon one's adversary has." He also notes, "If the administration wishes to use the MX as a bargaining chip, it is in our interest to keep the MX as a prospective weapon, not an actual one."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Colby's letter brings some hard facts about the military and political value of the MX to our attention. I strongly urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to his arguments, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing any further production of the MX missile.

The letter follows:

WILLIAM E. COLBY

Washington, DC, March 1985.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Once again the MX albatross hangs around the neck of Congress and the Nation as the administration calls for the lifting of congressional restrictions on building 21 more of these monster weapons and looks ahead to more in the coming year. The protagonists—and antagonists—are almost equally exhausted by the reiteration of the standard arguments on each side about the missile. All admit that the weapon is of little substantive value to the Nation's arsenal, is unacceptably vulnerable, and that the sole reason for going ahead with production is to show U.S. will and determination as we enter the Geneva negotiations with the Soviets. But to decide against building more MX's would show something even more important than national will—wisdom. A show of wisdom is in the interest of all who hope for positive results from the Geneva talks.

The reasons for dropping the MX are simple:

The MX is ineffective. Thirty-six basing systems have been studied for the missile, including the Carter Administration's Rube Goldberg race track in the Utah and Nevada deserts. All basing proposals have been found wanting by the Pentagon or Congress. The MX is less effective at what should be its primary function—certain retaliation in the event of a nuclear attack on the United States—than the present mix of missiles on land, at sea, and in the air.

The MX is dangerous. The MX's size and accuracy suggest to the Soviets that its real purpose is to give the United States the capability of a devastating first strike against the Soviet Union, since the weapon adds little to our retaliatory capability. Thus the MX can only generate the implementation of procedures by the Soviet Union that will enable its forces to react instantly to indications of an MX launch. The likelihood of an accidental nuclear war, then, is increased, as the Soviets may respond with real weapons to false indications of an MX attack.

The fact that the Soviets currently have weapons of equal or even greater power than the MX is not a reason for the United States to build the MX if our present retaliatory capability is absolute. And it is. The test of need for a weapon is whether it accomplishes its mission without counterproductive effects, not whether it is the same weapon one's adversary has.

The MX is not a bargaining chip. The last refuge of the arms advocate, if no other reason can be found to justify a weapon's acquisition, is that it could be traded for a concession by the other side. This poker game analogy is only valid if the other side values the chip, as strategic weapons do not have agreed colors of blue for high value. The most recent expressions of Soviet concern do not even mention the MX; for example, the definitive Pravda editorial of February 9, carefully reprinted at advertising rates in the Washington Post of February 26, was designed to send a message to the Washington political community. The editorial made plain that the real bargaining chips the Soviets respect are elements of President Reagan's star war plan, a plan the President had proclaimed nonnegotiable. Thus the search for an effective negotiating chip must focus elsewhere if we are to attract the Russian bargaining instinct. Indeed, experience in these negotiations has established a simple rule: A weapon is valuable as a negotiating chip while it is on the drawing boards, but once it is employed, it cannot be traded away. Thus if the Administration wishes to use the MX as a bargaining chip, it is in our interest to keep it as a prospective weapon, not an actual one.

The cost of the MX is the least of the arguments against it, since the cost should be borne if the weapon were a necessary one. But the budgetary deficit our Nation faces does force our citizenry and our Government to choose carefully those weapons truly necessary for our security. We must not mindlessly purchase every device, without consideration of cost. The more important contributions to our national security in the fields of conventional weapons, readiness, training, and logistic reserves far outweigh the MX in their importance to our safety, as does the vitality of an economy unencumbered by an unconscionable deficit.

President Reagan recently cited a biblical passage to deliver a lesson on prudence in the face of an adversary. He might have turned to a more apposite passage, the study of David and Goliath. Overarmed, musclebound, and heavily armored, it appeared that Goliath had all the advantages. Yet he was defeated by David, who had the right weapon, and a tactic aimed at his enemy's vulnerable point. Our experience in Vietnam should have sensitized us to this comparison. Our fixation on the MX calls into question whether we have indeed learned that lesson.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. COLBY.●

PROVIDING FOR PRESCRIPTION  
DRUG PAYMENTS FOR SENIORS

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will expand the current Medicaid Program to provide out-of-hospital prescription drug coverage to approximately 7.5 million elderly persons over age 65 with limited incomes.

This legislation would establish a new medically needy category under the current Medicaid Program. It would help those who are most affected by high prescription costs: those chronically ill aged individuals whose incomes are too high to be eligible for Medicaid, yet whose prescription drug expenses represent a significant percentage of their yearly income. I believe it meets a vital need of the elderly, particularly those with chronic illnesses and conditions which require medications essential for their well-being and even their survival. For those senior citizens with limited and fixed incomes, the legislation would help to cushion the ever-rising costs of drugs and pharmaceuticals.

It is almost identical to legislation that I introduced last year, along with Congressmen PEPPER and ROYBAL—H.R. 5977—the Pharmaceutical Assistance Act for the Aged. We have made minor modifications in last year's legislation based upon comments that we received from the 50 State Medicaid directors that were asked to comment upon this bill. In the 98th Congress, this bill enjoyed bipartisan support from 38 Members of Congress.

Specifically, this legislation—the Pharmaceutical Assistance Act for the Aged—would provide Medicaid matching funds to any State that wants to establish a medically needy program to help pay for prescription drugs, insulin, insulin syringes, and insulin needles for its citizens over 65 years of age whose annual incomes are not in excess of \$12,000 for an individual or \$15,000 for a married couple living together. The program would require that, unless medically inappropriate, generic drugs be used, and that the person pay a copayment ranging from \$2 to \$5 as follows: \$2 for drugs costing less than \$10; \$3 for drugs costing between \$10 and \$25; \$4 for drugs costing between \$25 and \$50, and; \$5 for drugs costing over \$50. The variable copayment is intended to discourage too large a prescription unit from being prescribed at one time in order to avoid making multiple copayments. The pharmacist would be reimbursed for the reasonable cost established by the State for the drug, minus the amount of the copayment, plus a dispensing fee.

The need for this legislation is evidenced by the fact that our current system of providing health care for the elderly is woefully inadequate. Medicare, as we have heard time and time again, does not cover the costs of prescription drugs for nonhospitalized elderly. Medicaid, which does provide this coverage, does not cover those low-income elderly whose incomes exceed the relatively low SSI related income and resource limits. Yet, out-of-pocket expenditures by seniors for prescription drugs represent the second largest source of payment for the elderly's health care expenses—29 percent—an estimated \$1,575 per person in 1984. Drugs now account for almost 23 percent of all private health care expenses for older Americans.

The burden to pay for drugs which are, in many instances, life-sustaining falls most heavily on those who can least afford it: the low-income elderly who suffer from chronic illness, most of whom are not covered by Medicaid. Drug costs for this group are nearly six times as great as for younger Americans. Of the total expenditures for drugs for the aged, only 13 percent are covered by public programs; 87 percent must now be paid out-of-pocket. Experience with a program to pay for drugs for the elderly in New Jersey covering the same income and age categories shows that the average senior spends \$242 out of his or her own pocket per year to pay for prescription drugs. These figures do not reflect the full burden of drug costs for the chronically ill elderly, whose costs are substantially higher than this \$242 figure.

Proposals for drug coverage of prescription drugs for the elderly have been considered by Congress in the past. Drug legislation was passed by the Senate in 1967, 1972, and 1973 but did not make it through the conference with the House. The arguments against the legislation were that such a program would cost too much, could not be controlled, and could not be efficiently administered. These were all proposals to place a drug program either under Medicare or under a new separate agency. My proposal keeps Federal and State costs to a minimum and builds upon the current Medicaid system.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 7.5 million elderly would be assisted under this program. The bill sets no limits on the number of prescriptions that would be paid for per year. However, it is fair to assume that the average senior would fill or refill 22 prescriptions per year with an average cost per prescription of \$13. Therefore, if all 50 States participate in this program, on a 50-50 matching basis, and assuming establishment of the most generous income limitations allowed under this bill, the annual cost to the Government might reach

\$1 billion. According to Secretary Heckler, fraud, waste, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs cost approximately \$7 billion per year. Efforts by the Department of Health and Human Services to attack this problem vigorously should continue—and the savings should be directly applied to the support of this program.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I have been in the forefront of efforts in this House to assure adequate protection of health benefits for the elderly. Last year, the Subcommittee on Human Services conducted a hearing on the vast problems faced by seniors in this regard. We were told by a variety of witnesses that the current system of Medicare coverage is inadequate. It is inadequate because it fails to meet some of the most very basic health care needs of the elderly, including drugs. Our findings demonstrated that the need for this bill is great and its provisions received endorsement from a variety of groups and individuals, including national aging organizations.

Presently, five States have implemented programs to financially assist eligible elderly in defraying prescription drug expenses: New Jersey, Maine, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania; New Jersey passed legislation that is most similar to what I am introducing today. We need to encourage expansion on a national basis so that all needy elderly can receive some modest assistance in this area. This bill would provide the impetus for States, in partnership with the Federal Government, to provide comprehensive health care for the elderly. Adoption of this legislation would provide the impetus we need to subsequently expand benefits under Medicare, to assure that all elderly citizens are provided this kind of health insurance, to which they are entitled.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the text of this bill into the RECORD. I urge them to join with me in supporting this initiative. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1542

A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for an optional program of pharmaceutical assistance to the aged under the Medicaid program.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

Section 1. Short Title.

This Act may be cited as the "Pharmaceutical Assistance to the Aged Act".

Title XIX of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"PHARMACEUTICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED

"SEC. 1919. (a) OPTIONAL PROGRAM OF STATE.—(1) Notwithstanding sections 1902(a)(10) and 1916 of this Act, a State plan for medical assistance under this title may provide for making medical assistance available with respect to individuals de-

scribed in subsection (b) for outpatient prescribed drugs and other items described in subsection (c) furnished in accordance with subsection (d), but only if—

"(A) the State has in effect a law meeting the requirements of paragraph (2)(A),

"(B) the State plan under this title provides that the amount of payment under the plan with respect to bioequivalent drug products for which substitution by a pharmacist is permitted under paragraph (2)(A) shall not exceed the amount of payment recognized under the plan for the least expensive of such bioequivalent drug products that are available or normally stocked, and

(C) the State has a program of utilization review of such drugs and items which is satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(2)(A) A State law referred to in paragraph (1) is a law which permits a licensed pharmacist to substitute an bioequivalent drug product (as defined in subparagraph (B)) of lesser cost for another drug product, unless a licensed physician specifically states with respect to that prescription that such substitution is medically inappropriate.

"(B) For purposes of this subsection, drug products shall be considered to be bioequivalent with each other with respect to a medical indication or treatment if the drug products are bioequivalent (as determined by the Secretary) with respect to such medical indication or treatment.

"(3)(A) The amount of the medical assistance furnished under this plan with respect to a prescribed drug or other item is the amount determined under subparagraph (B) reduced by a copayment amount determined under subparagraph (C).

"(B) The amount of payment under this section for a drug product is the amount otherwise allowable under the plan (subject to paragraph (1)(B)) with respect to the item, with regard to any deductibles, coinsurance, or copayments which might otherwise be imposed.

"(C) In the case of an individual eligible for medical assistance under the plan under this section—

"(i) no enrollment fee, premium, or similar charge will be imposed under the plan, and

"(ii) no deduction, cost sharing, or similar charge will be imposed under the plan, except that payment of a copayment in an amount described in subparagraph (D) shall be required under the plan with respect to each prescription unit of drug or item provided and may not be waived directly or indirectly (such as through a discount).

"(D) In the case of a prescribed drug or other item for which payment under this section for a prescription unit otherwise is—

"(i) less than \$10, the copayment amount referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii) is equal to \$2,

"(ii) \$10 or more, but less than \$25, the copayment amount referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii) is equal to \$3,

"(iii) \$25 or more, but less than \$50, the copayment amount referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii) is equal to \$4, and

"(iv) \$50 or more, the copayment amount referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii) is equal to \$5.

The Secretary shall provide guidelines for the establishment of reasonable prescription units for purposes of implementation of this section.

"(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—(1) An individual referred to in subsection (a) is an individual who—

"(A) is 65 years of age or older,

"(B) is a resident of the United States and is either (i) a citizen or (ii) an alien lawfully

admitted for permanent residence or otherwise permanently residing in the United States under color of law (including an alien lawfully present in the United States as a result of the application of section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act),

"(C) has an annual income (as determined under paragraph (2)) of not more than the income limitation established by the State under paragraph (3), and

"(D) is not otherwise eligible for medical assistance under the plan.

"(2) As used in paragraph (1), the term 'annual income' means gross annual income from all sources, including alimony or support funds, the gross amount of pensions and annuities, benefits received under this Act (other than under this title or titles V or XVIII), benefits received under State unemployment insurance laws and veterans' disability payments, interest received from the Federal Government or any State government or any instrumentality or political subdivision thereof, realized capital gains, rentals, workers' compensation benefits and life insurance benefits and proceeds, except that such term does not include—

"(A) the first \$5,000 of the total of death benefits payments received with respect to the death of a spouse,

"(B) gifts of cash or property, to the extent they do not exceed a total of \$300 in any year, or

"(C) surplus food or other relief in kind supplied by a government agency or as a property tax rebate.

"(3) A State, for purposes of this section, may establish an income limitation of—

"(A) not less than \$9,000, nor more than \$12,000, with respect to individuals (i) who are not married or (ii) who are married but who maintain a separate residence apart from their spouse and who do not receive support from their spouse or have access to their spouse's income, or

"(B) not less than \$12,000, nor more than \$15,000, with respect to other individuals who are married.

In the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B), the income limitation shall be applied to the aggregate annual income of the individual and the individual's spouse.

"(4) A State shall provide for recertification of income of individuals described in paragraph (1) who have applied and been found eligible for benefits under this section not less often than annually.

"(c) COVERED DRUGS AND ITEMS.—The outpatient prescribed drugs and other items referred to in subsection (a) means legend drugs (other than experimental drugs) which are only available under State law upon the prescription of a physician, insulin, insulin syringes, and insulin needles furnished or administered to an individual while the individual is not an inpatient of a hospital, skilled nursing facility, intermediate care facility, or mental institution.

"(d) INFORMATION TO ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—The Secretary shall provide, not less often than annually, for informing individuals who—

"(1) are 65 years of age or older and

"(2) are entitled to benefits under part A, or enrolled for benefits under part B, of title XVIII,

of the benefits available under this section in States which have elected to have a program of pharmaceutical assistance for the aged pursuant to this section."

#### SEC. 3. CONFORMING MEDICAID AMENDMENTS.

Section 1902(a)(10) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(a)(10)) is amended by

striking out "and" at the end of clause (III), and by adding before the semicolon at the end the following: ", and (V) this paragraph shall not apply with respect to the provision of medical assistance described in section 1919".

(b) PROMPT PAYMENT FOR PHARMACISTS.—Section 1902(a)(37) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(s)(37)) is amended by inserting "for prescribed drugs under the plan or" after "payment made".

#### SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATES.

SEC. 4. (a) FINAL REGULATIONS BY SEPTEMBER 1, 1985.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate final regulations not later than September 1, 1985, in order to provide for State implementation of the amendments made by this Act on a timely basis.

(b) EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1985.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to medical assistance furnished with respect to outpatient prescribed drugs furnished on or after October 1, 1985.

#### SEC. 5. REPORTS.

SEC. 5. (a) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall maintain statistical records on State programs of pharmaceutical assistance to the aged under section 1919 of the Social Security Act to determine the effectiveness and impact of such programs, including the level of participation by the elderly and any patterns of unusual drug usage, and to provide for the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—Based on such information, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress, at the time of the transmittal of the budget of the Department of Health and Human Services to the Congress for fiscal year 1987, containing information relating to—

(1) the States providing for such programs,

(2) the number of persons covered under such programs,

(3) the number and kinds of drug products for which assistance was provided under such programs,

(4) the costs of the assistance furnished, including an estimate of actual expenses incurred by pharmacists participating in such programs, and

(5) the timeliness and accuracy of payments made to pharmacists under such programs.

The report also shall contain such recommendations for changes in legislation as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.●

WILLIAM AMORY UNDERHILL

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a great American—my personal friend, William Amory Underhill.

On February 21, 1985, Amory Underhill celebrated his 75th birthday. While Amory is known to many in this House as a dear friend of Florida and a guiding light of the Florida delegation, few know of his long service to the Nation starting as a lieutenant commander in the Navy during WWII

and including service in the Truman administration's Justice Department where he served as Assistant Attorney General until 1952.

Since that time, Amory has continued to serve his Nation, his State and his fellow human beings in varied capacities and through an unending commitment of his own time and resources.

He received his LL.B. from John B. Stetson University in 1936, and was admitted to the Florida Bar that same year. In 1946, Amory was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and was later admitted to the District of Columbia Bar in 1952.

His honors include:

LL.D. (honorary) Stetson University College of Law, 1969 Honorary Doctorate from Saint Leo College, Saint Leo, FL (1980).

George Washington Honor Medal Award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, 1970.

Ben C. Willard Award from Stetson Lawyer's Association, 1970.

C.H.I.E.F. Award from Independent Colleges & Universities of Florida, Inc. 1974.

Distinguished Alumni Award from Stetson University Alumni Association 1974.

Bob Sikes Award from the Florida State Society, Washington, DC, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, Amory Underhill has been a "public servant" in the very best sense of that term. His devotion to the values of our great Nation stand as an example for those of us who serve in representative government.

Amory has distinguished himself as the most generous and unselfish person I have ever known, I am proud to call him "friend".

We do ourselves honor, as we honor this great American. ●

**EVERYBODY HAS A STAKE IN NATION'S FARM SYSTEM**

**HON. STAN LUNDINE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent column from the Sunday edition of the Buffalo News entitled "Everybody Has a Stake in Nation's Farm System." I believe that Max McCarthy has hit the nail on the head. What we need in this country is less emphasis on building up our defenses and overthrowing governments which are not friendly to the United States, and more emphasis on efforts designed to save our Nation's basic economic generators: agriculture and industry.

We should not stand back and watch the farmers go under. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress must try

once again to put together a farm credit package so that the dairy farmers in upstate New York will survive the heavy spring production season, and our grain farmers in the Midwest can get their spring crops in the ground. If we can spend \$1 billion a day on defense, I see no reason why we cannot extend a little extra credit to our farmers who provide us with the most abundant and diversified food supply in the world.

While I am not against reforming our agricultural policies so that the CCC is not overloaded with surplus commodities and the support prices are not keeping the price for commodities unreasonably high, I cannot support the President's dogged commitment to a hands off farm policy. We need to give our farmers a hand up, not the back of the hand.

In my district I have grape farmers who do not receive any Federal aid. Their crop is bought and sold in the free market and they are not prospering by any stretch of imagination. As a matter of fact, many of my grape farmers will be forced to go out of business due to cancellations of contracts from the large cooperatives who no longer need our New York grapes, and the declining market for New York State wine. Domestic wine simply cannot compete with the subsidized foreign wines which are much cheaper. The California vineyards are suffering as well, but the effect has not been as dramatic as it has been on the New York State farm wineries. I believe that the case of grapes as an unsupported commodity lends credence to the argument that a total hands off policy is not the answer to the troubles in our agricultural economy.

I would like to conclude by saying that I hope my colleagues will read and appreciate Mr. McCarthy's column. I enjoyed this column very much and I share Mr. McCarthy's sentiments entirely. I do not believe that the situation is hopeless for American agriculture, and you can count on my active participation when the Congress considers the farm bill later this year.

[From The Buffalo News, Mar. 10, 1985]

**EVERYBODY HAS A STAKE IN NATION'S FARM SYSTEM**

(By Max McCarthy)

One of the greatest strengths of the United States is its incredibly abundant and effective agricultural system.

Not only are we blessed with an almost endless variety of nutritious and low-cost meat, poultry, vegetables, fruits, baked goods and dairy products, but we grow more than enough to export huge amounts.

One need only think of the agricultural problems Ethiopia and the Soviet Union to realize how fortunate we are.

With this in mind it only stands to reason that we should be very careful not to literally and figuratively upset the U.S. apple cart.

This is what the Reagan administration is trying to do with its ideologically inspired

rush to a free market in agriculture. One can't go overnight from the complicated farm support system which, for all of its complexities, has served the wider public interest better than almost any other nation in the world.

Urban and suburban dwellers who benefit from our marvelous food supply system should lend understanding ears to the plight of their country cousins. We all have a stake in this serious situation. It goes to the heart of this nation's strength and prosperity.

And it should be stressed to residents of the Niagara Frontier, the current crisis is not just something that affects wheat farmers in Kansas and growers of corn in Iowa. It affects dairy and other farmers in Western New York.

My long-time Buffalo News colleague Bob Buyer has been reporting on the plight of area farmers. Unlike grain growers in the Midwest who borrowed funds at high interest rates to expand their farms in the hope of reaping export profits, upstate New York farms borrowed to start or improve small dairy farms.

"We're not looking to get rich," Paul Herring of Fillmore told Bob Buyer. "We just want to live and farm."

Jim Brown of Short Tract told my colleague that his 17,000 pounds per cow dairy herd last year earned a modest \$32,000. Of that total, more than half, \$17,000, went right back to the Farmers Home Administration to repay loans. With the remaining \$15,000, Brown had to buy fuel, food, feed, clothing and other necessities for the cows, his two children, his wife and himself in that order.

Mrs. Brown told Buyer that when she and her daughter go shopping for groceries she sends her daughter out from the check-out counter with the packages so that the youngster won't see the food stamps she uses to pay for the purchase.

"I cry myself to sleep thinking of some other Allegany County farmers," confided Marilyn Herring of Fillmore.

Surely, the United States can do better for these farmers who have done so much for us! This is not fair or even intelligent. We are, again literally and figuratively, killing the goose that lays our eggs.

From Maine to California, U.S. farmers are caught in a crisis of national proportions. Three years into an agricultural depression, farm prices have plunged and markets abroad are shrinking because of the over-priced U.S. dollar.

As spring planting approaches, U.S. farmers like the Browns and the Herrings, struggling under \$212 billion in farm debt, have seen many sources of credit go dry.

Neil Harl, a respected U.S. agricultural economist, warns that almost 30 percent of American farms are sinking into insolvency. With a higher percentage of small farms and few large corporate farms in Western New York, our agricultural crisis is that much more serious and tragic. More than 12 percent of the farmers nationwide are expected to go out of business this year! That percentage could be even higher in New York State.

"This situation affects people," David Senter, American Agriculture Movement National director told farmers at a rally here last week. "Some commit suicide, some just quit, some drink . . . but it made me mad and I'm going to do all I can to change it."

The farmers who came to Washington last week want two things: short-term financial

aid in the form of federal loans so they can plant this year and reinstatement of a federal price policy based on annual average production costs. These are not outlandish requests or, for that matter, so costly in direct U.S. Treasury outlays.

The House and the Senate have passed emergency legislation that would provide some help, but President Reagan vetoed it last Wednesday.

His priorities and obsessive preoccupations in his second term are three incredibly expensive and highly dubious adventures:

His \$1 trillion Star Wars.

The MX missile—the Edsel of the Atomic age.

Aid to the rag-tag bunch trying to overthrow the legitimate government of Nicaragua.

Because of his Pentagon buildup and tax cuts the nation has enormous deficits and the White House says it can't afford to help the farmers. In the meantime, defense contractors try to get the government to pay for the housing of dogs and political contributions to lawmakers.

Our priorities are badly out of whack! The human factor is being sacrificed to ideology: "free markets," technological superiority over the Russians and the overthrow of governments we don't like.

Americans should rise up and demand that their senators and congressmen—Democrats and Republicans alike—produce a new vote-proof emergency farm bill and begin getting our perspectives in proper order. ●

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD'S  
UPBEAT MESSAGE: "MICHIGAN  
IS BACK!"

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal reports on the amazing comeback of the State of Michigan since 1982, led by Gov. James J. Blanchard.

The article has messages for us here in Washington. Blanchard tells us to dwell on solutions, not problems, to stick to our priorities, and to act decisively.

For the Republicans in control of the White House and the Senate, the message is that budgets can be balanced, deficits can be cut, productive economic investments can be made, and that your record here in Washington can be compared to that of active Democrats back in the States.

The Blanchard record shows that problems can be solved: that Blanchard has delivered on promises that President Reagan has only talked about—balancing the budget and setting priorities. As the Wall Street Journal article states:

The Republican budget in Washington has doubled the national debt in four years \* \* \* the Democratic budget in Lansing has paid off our entire state debt in three years, a debt inherited from the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, Michigan's economy is growing and State government is back

on sound fiscal footing, thanks to Governor Blanchard's leadership. But unemployment remains too high, and the President's recent decision to lift auto-import quotas could derail our State's recovery and its finances. Even so, with the strong and positive leadership of Democrats like Governor Blanchard, future problems can be solved, and Michigan's future remains upbeat.

I recommend the article to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 19, 1985]

(By Dennis Farney)

LANSING, MICH.—From his upbeat declaration—"Michigan is back" to the "It CAN be done" plaque behind his desk, Gov. James Blanchard strikes a different note than voters often hear from liberal Democrats.

He exudes optimism. He dwells on solutions, not problems. His priorities remain a Democrat's priorities. But he sounds like the Republican president who proclaimed last fall that "America is back."

"Wrist-slashing Democrats—I don't even like to be in the same room with them," declares the 42-year-old governor.

Positive thinking can carry you only so far. But positive thinking—combined with decisive action and a little luck—has helped. Mr. Blanchard, the first Democrat to govern Michigan in 20 years, to rebound from a rocky start in 1983. There's a lesson here that beaten-down, gloomy-sounding Democrats in Washington just might take to heart.

"You have to come across as an optimist," says Mr. Blanchard. "On that, I say hats off to Ronald Reagan."

Two years ago, there was little cause for optimism here, Michigan was reaping the whirlwind. The state, which has postponed addressing some fundamental state problems in good times, was in a near-depression.

Inauguration day found Michigan with the nation's highest unemployment rate, 17%, and its lowest credit rating. It also had a \$1.7 billion deficit. A dozen universities and 75 or more school districts were about to run out of money.

Backed by the then-Democratic legislature, Gov. Blanchard pushed through a 38% increase in the state income-tax rate. It was temporary; by law, it had to be phased out between January 1984 and October 1987. But the boost was abrupt and the governor failed to adequately prepare public opinion for it.

The result: a political firestorm.irate voters launched a recall drive. Six months into Gov. Blanchard's term, a Detroit News poll found only 33% approval of his performance—and 53% disapproval.

Since then, there has been a dramatic turnaround. Michigan's economy roared back faster than expected, and the tax increase has brought in more than expected. By year's end, Michigan will eliminate that \$1.7 billion deficit. Moody's has raised the bond rating a notch from Baa-1. And Michigan's tax revolt, although still potent, has suffered a major setback. Last November, voters decisively rejected Proposal C, which would have rolled back the Blanchard tax and then some. That victory for the governor was supported by a cross-section of Michigan's civic leadership.

"Jim Blanchard beat Proposal C," says Democratic House speaker Gary Owen. "He went out front, he raised the campaign money. And his popularity has been going

up ever since." A December Detroit News poll found 66% approval, only 26% disapproval.

Even so, neither the governor nor his state are out of the woods. Mr. Blanchard's 1986 reelection prospects are riding on Michigan's continued economic recovery, and on the way he navigates some fairly treacherous political crosscurrents.

Michigan's unemployment rate, at 9.2%, remains high. President Reagan's decision to lift auto-import quotas surely will hurt Michigan auto makers and state revenue too. The state's buildings, roads and bridges need massive repairs—for only the first time in a decade, Michigan is repairing roads faster than they're wearing out—even as some voters clamor for tax reductions. The tax revolt has given Republicans control of the Michigan Senate. And should Michigan lose General Motors Corp.'s futuristic Saturn project to another state, it would hurt the governor, who has portrayed himself as a man who can work innovatively with business and labor. (As a congressman, he was an architect of the Chrysler Corp. loan guarantee.)

"Jim Blanchard's approval ratings are higher, but they're very thin," says state GOP chairman Spencer Abraham. "It's a lot like Jimmy Carter's approval ratings in the middle of his term. People see the governor as well-meaning and a nice person. But nobody says 'strong leader.'" A half-dozen or so Republicans, including veteran Congressman Guy Vander Jagt, are weighing possible gubernatorial bids.

For Michigan Republicans, the 1983 tax increase remains the prime issue. The GOP-controlled state Senate, arguing that Michigan will soon have an unnecessary surplus, has voted to end the temporary tax next January. That would save taxpayers between \$850 million and \$1 billion, compared with the October 1987 phase-out. Democrats in the legislature are "nervous," Mr. Blanchard concedes.

"I've been advised by other governors that the last thing you want going into an election is a surplus," he says. So he has begun to explore a possible acceleration of the October 1987 termination date.

One idea is to couple any accelerated roll-back with tax "reform" and increased state relief for hard-pressed local property taxpayers. Drafting this proposal is the task of state Treasurer Robert Bowman, the brash, wisecracking 29-year-old whom Gov. Blanchard recruited from Lehman Brothers. Before 1983, "Michigan had been robbing Peter to pay Paul for years," Mr. Bowman says. "The question for Democrats is: Can we somehow offer fiscal realism and still offer hope and opportunity?"

Fiscal realism, in this administration, has meant doing things that, until recent years, would have been almost unthinkable for a Democrat. Gov. Blanchard has cut the state bureaucracy by 20%. He proposed a zero increase in his 1984-1985 budget total; there is a proposed 2.3% increase in his 1985-1986 budget, still less than inflation.

Budget austerity, however, risks disappointing traditional Democratic supporters among the urban poor. Gov. Blanchard has tried to appeal to them by boosting spending, with the overall ceiling, for education, environmental cleanup and economic development. Democrats would like more, says Speaker Owen, "but we realize the dollars aren't there."

All in all, a jaunty Mr. Blanchard argues he has delivered on two promises that Ronald Reagan only talks about—balancing

the budget and setting priorities. Last month, at the state Democratic convention, he sharpened the needle.

"The Republican budget in Washington has doubled the national debt in four years," he said. "The Democratic budget in Lansing has paid off our entire state debt in three years, a debt inherited from the Republicans."

That could be an appealing argument in the 1986 campaign. Republicans then will surely argue that Ronald Reagan's economic recovery was the real engine of Michigan's turnaround and that, in the words of state Senate Majority Leader John Engler, himself a potential gubernatorial candidate, the Blanchard tax was "too high and stayed on too long." But Michigan Republicans themselves disagree on just how high taxes should be. Proposal C was spearheaded by Richard Headlee, Mr. Blanchard's conservative Republican opponent in 1982—and opposed by former GOP governors, George Romney and William Milliken, who joined Gov. Blanchard on television to warn against it.

In any event, the governor retains the option of proposing to lower taxes as campaign time approaches. "It's delightful to be in a situation where you're talking about how fast to cut taxes," he grins. "Frankly, I'd rather have my options than Ronald Reagan's, Bob Dole's or Tip O'Neill's."●

#### USIA'S ADVISORY COMMISSION REPORTS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy has issued its 1985 report. At a time when there is an increasing need to understand—and to support—the various aspects of our Nation's public diplomacy programs, carried out by the men and women of the U.S. Information Agency, this report deserves close attention. I hope our colleagues get a chance to read it. In the meantime, I am inserting in the RECORD the message from the Chairman of the Advisory Board, Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., and the summary of findings and recommendations of the Commission.

##### A MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Four years ago this Commission was gravely concerned about the prospects for public diplomacy. In their assessments of USIA our predecessors found a crystal-set mentality and vacuum-tube technology in an era of microchips and communications satellites. They found seriously eroded budget and staff resources, and a foreign policy decision-making process frequently uninformed by an understanding of foreign opinions and cultures.

Today, there are many reasons why this bleak outlook is changing.

With strong bipartisan support from the Congress, the Reagan Administration has revitalized USIA and under the creative leadership of Charles Z. Wick made public diplomacy a central part of the conduct of American foreign policy. USIA is modernizing. Its influence within the foreign affairs community has dramatically increased, and

its resources have grown significantly. Much has been accomplished.

In this report, my colleagues and I have sought to document this progress and at the same time address those challenges that still confront the Agency. Each of us brings a unique set of experiences and perspectives to our Commission role. The views set forth have been considered with care.

In examining the way our country conducts public diplomacy, we have been struck forcefully by the dual role assigned to USIA by the Congress.

The Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 requires USIA to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries through the dissemination of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 authorizes the Agency to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries through educational and cultural exchanges.

The two Acts—when read together in the context of 35 years of practice under administrations of both political parties—give USIA an obligation both to articulate persuasively the policies of the U.S. Government and to carry out educational and cultural programs. The two missions are complementary, and public diplomacy is indeed more than the sum of its parts.

It is not one-shot dramatic efforts that make public diplomacy succeed. Rather, it is the steady, wise use of all of the resources of public diplomacy over time. It is recognition by those who seek disproportionately to enhance educational and cultural exchanges that the articulation of U.S. policies is also necessary to mutual understanding and rational international dialogue. It is understanding by those who support the vigorous expression of U.S. policies that the Fulbright and International Visitors programs provide foreign audiences with the background and knowledge of our culture that put those policies in perspective. And it is appreciation by our elected and appointed officials of the importance of foreign public opinion and the power of ideas in international political discourse.

This report contains the principal findings and recommendations of the Commission during the past year. We have focused on a number of new Agency initiatives such as the satellite television network WORLDNET, computerized transmission of the Wireless File, and modernization of the Voice of America. We have examined selectively the needs and contributions of USIA's traditional programs—exchanges, foreign press centers, English teaching, and others. We have not ignored national news media reports of policy and managerial problems that have concerned many Americans and members of Congress.

Shortly after the bombing of the U.S. embassy in East Beirut, I received a letter from an NBC news correspondent bringing to my attention the diligence and professionalism of a junior foreign service officer assigned to that difficult post. She happened to be the only USIA employee there at the time. The letter brought home once again the realization that public diplomacy professionals face the challenge of physical danger as well as the task of explaining the nuances of U.S. foreign policy to an often skeptical world. USIA's libraries, information centers, and other installations—usually located separately from American embassies in areas that afford public access—are often the

most visible and vulnerable parts of the U.S. presence overseas. My colleagues and I have a high regard for the quality of USIA's personnel, both Americans and foreign nationals. We have watched them operate first-hand. They are doing a difficult job well.

Congress has given the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy a mandate which we have taken seriously—to represent the public interest in assessing the public diplomacy of the United States. Because Congress has made an institutional commitment for more than thirty years to the need for the judgment and long-range perspective of an informed advisory body, we urge its members to consider these views with care.

Ours is a favorable balance sheet. The American people can be pleased with the work that USIA is doing. It is our hope this report will be read by everyone interested in public diplomacy.

EDWIN J. FEULNER, JR.,

Chairman.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

##### TELEVISION

The Commission welcomes the emergence of television as a major program arm of USIA and fully endorses the Agency's initiatives in utilizing communication satellites and new video technologies.

The Commission recommends that as a high priority USIA, with the support of other government agencies, plan for the establishment of a worldwide system of television broadcasting to enable U.S. leaders to speak directly to audiences in every region of the world.

##### VOICE OF AMERICA

The Commission reaffirms its support of VOA modernization and believes it is vitally important that the U.S. remain committed to a multi-year program designed to produce a strong, reliable VOA signal worldwide.

The Commission recommends that USIA take steps to instill a greater sense of urgency among all Agency elements involved in VOA modernization and establish a mechanism to promote communication and cooperation at the senior level Agency-wide.

The Commission commends VOA and those Public Affairs Officers who have initiated training programs for Third World national broadcasting organizations. The Commission recommends this effort be expanded.

##### RADIO MARTI PROGRAM

The Commission recommends that a reorganization plan transferring the Radio Marti Program to the Board for International Broadcasting be proposed to the Congress and that the Congress act favorably on such a plan.

##### WIRELESS FILE

The Commission welcomes USIA's decision to make computerized transmission of the Wireless File a high priority and commends the use of program evaluation techniques by Wireless File managers. Automation of the File combines one of the Agency's most effective information services with the technology of the 1980s.

##### BOOKS AND LIBRARIES

The Commission is deeply concerned that the U.S. is not competitive in international book and library activities. Needed increases in resources for overseas American libraries and for USIA's book translation and donated book programs will require the sustained

cooperation of USIA, the Congress and the private sector.

#### THE CENTRAL AMERICAN INITIATIVE

The Commission fully endorses the recommendation of the Kissinger Commission that government-sponsored scholarships to bring Central American students to the U.S. be greatly increased to counter expanded Soviet bloc scholarship programs.

#### RESEARCH

The Commission recommends that a coordinated research effort, involving all U.S. foreign affairs agencies, be organized under the direction of the National Security Council to provide the U.S. Government with timely comparative data on the cultural, information and propaganda policies and programs of the Soviet bloc and other countries.

The Commission recommends that USIA increase its utilization of the Office of Research to assess the impact and effectiveness of Agency products and programs.

The Commission recommends that USIA be invited to participate regularly in meetings of interdepartmental groups where options for new policies are developed and be asked routinely to assess the impact of proposed foreign policies.

The Commission finds that USIA's resources are insufficient to provide the research capability that national security requires and that the Agency needs to make its resource management and programming more efficient.

#### SEMANTIC CORRUPTION

The Commission repeats its recommendation that the National Security Council and USIA assess the problem of semantic corruption and institutionalize ways to counter misleading terminology and increase the accuracy of words and concepts in international political discourse.

#### SENIOR VACANCIES

The Commission recommends that the Director and the White House move quickly to fill long-standing vacancies in the positions of USIA Deputy Director, USIA Associate Director for Programs, and Director of the Voice of America.

#### HEADQUARTERS CONTROVERSIES

The Commission finds that interest abroad in recent USIA headquarters controversies was marginal and that there was no discernible adverse impact on USIA's overseas programs and activities.

The Commission recommends that USIA provide clearer operational guidance on speaker selection criteria and the relationship between advocacy and education in its speaker programming policies.

The Commission recommends that USIA encourage responsible internal discussion of professional public diplomacy issues and provide an appropriate forum for doing so.

#### REPRESENTATION

The Commission finds that personal contact with foreign opinion leaders is one of the most important functions of public diplomacy. A substantial increase in USIA's overseas representation funds would serve the national interest.

#### CONGRESSIONAL GRANT CONTROLS

The Commission finds the requirement that Congress be notified 15 days in advance of all USIA program grants is neither necessary nor sound public policy and repeats its recommendation that the practice be discontinued.

#### NEED FOR MORE PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

New communications technology and program expansion, particularly in USIA's WORLDNET, educational exchange and International Visitors programs, have stretched the Agency's overseas staffs to the breaking point. The Commission strongly recommends that additional personnel be assigned to USIA's field posts.

#### TRAINING FOR MEDIA INTERVIEWS

The Commission recommends that USIA institute a program of training to prepare senior USIA officers, ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission for media interviews.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO MR. RONALD L. BLANC

#### HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the community and a personal friend of mine, Mr. Ronald L. Blanc. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this exceptional person who is being honored as Valley Beth Shalom's Man of the Year.

I first met Ronald Blanc when he was donating his time and experience in the fight to preserve and protect the Santa Monica Mountains. Appointed to the Santa Monica Mountains Comprehensive Planning Commission by Governor Brown, his leadership in that organization was instrumental in the fight to preserve this great natural resource. He has also been an outspoken supporter of the State of Israel, giving generously of his talent and energy on behalf of our closest and most reliable ally in the Middle East.

Throughout his career as a lawyer he has always shown a willingness and desire to give freely of his valuable time to aid organizations or causes important to his community. While running a successful law firm he has still found time to serve on the board of directors of a public interest law firm, as president of Valley Beth Shalom Synagogue from 1982 to 1984 and as their chairman from 1978 to 1981. This year he cochaired the Major Gift Campaign of the San Fernando Valley region United Jewish Fund. From 1982 to 1985 he served on the board of directors of the San Fernando Valley region of the Jewish Federation Council of Los Angeles.

It is my honor to join with my colleagues and the Valley Beth Shalom Synagogue in saluting Ronald L. Blanc, an invaluable resource to the community and a truly remarkable human being.●

#### A VA OUTPATIENT CLINIC IS NEEDED IN SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY

#### HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent Veterans Administration study, "Caring for the Older Veteran," predicted that by 1990, 7.2 million veterans will be over age 65, doubling 1980's total. My State of New Jersey is home to nearly 1 million veterans, and this veteran population is aging at such a tremendous rate that the added crunch will place further stress on a veterans health care network that is chronically overtaxed.

The 1984 VA Medical District Initiated Program Planning study includes a recommendation to establish a satellite outpatient clinic [OPC] in New Jersey through the fiscal year 1987 budget. Of the entire VA Medical District IV, which includes New Jersey, Delaware, and parts of Maryland and Pennsylvania, the New Jersey site is recognized as the highest priority.

To facilitate the placement of an OPC in southern New Jersey, I have joined with my colleagues from New Jersey and introduced H.R. 1424. This bill directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and operate an outpatient clinic in southern New Jersey.

The need for an OPC in southern New Jersey is acute. The only outpatient facility in the State is located in Newark and it has suffered from staffing shortages and equipment breakdowns. VA statistics indicate that there are parts of New Jersey which are capable of providing over 52,000 visits per year by veterans to such a facility. The minimum threshold cited by the VA for the placement of a clinic is only 15,000 visits per year.

The VA has relied upon these locally placed facilities as a means of lessening the workload at the primary VA Medical Centers. This far-sighted policy is based on the idea that adapting to the geographical changes in the veteran population is less expensive in the long term. Additionally, the medical care for comparatively minor problems can be offered at a local and more convenient level for our veterans.●

#### GOOD SCOUT AWARD

#### HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, It gives me great pride to announce that on

March 29, 1985, the Orange County Council Boy Scouts of America, will present Mr. James A. Peters with the 1985 Construction Industry's Good Scout Award.

Jim Peters is the founder and president of the J. M. Peters Company which is headquartered in Newport Beach, CA. The J. M. Peters Company is one of Orange County's most prestigious home-building firms. Since the Company's inception in 1975, they have built more than 3,000 homes in southern California.

In his dedication to his profession, Jim values high standards of personal achievement. He demands much from his business associates, but always more from himself. He is highly respected by members of the building community for his personal integrity, his business acumen and the quality of the housing he produces.

Jim Peters was born in San Diego, CA. He graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles, where he received his Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration.

Jim is very active in his community and serves on the Board of Directors of the Orange County Y.M.C.A., the Board of Trustees of the Mardan School, the Beta Theta Pi Fraternity and for years has been an active supporter of Scouting.

It will be a pleasure to join the construction industry on the 29th when it honors James M. Peters with the Good Scout Award.●

**ANTONINA B. PARKER, 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY**

**HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY**  
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, women have played a sustained and significant role in Connecticut's local and State governments for many decades. Their concerns have found expression in policy and legislation affecting in a positive way the lives of all Connecticut citizens. The combined energies and talents of caring women have enriched Connecticut's history.

Antonina B. Parker, of Glastonbury, is one of those caring women. For 25 years she has given unstintingly to her community, her State, and her party. Serving in positions of leadership wherever and whenever needed, her drive and commitment earned her the confidence of the voters of Glastonbury as a member of its town council and its board of finance, in both offices as the first woman. Her dedication in town service confirmed this confidence and led to her election as the representative of the 31st district in the Connecticut General Assembly for four consecutive terms.

During our years together at the State Capitol, Nina was of great assistance to the secretary of the State's office. She became a valued friend.

In appreciation of her 25 years of service to the community of Glastonbury and the State of Connecticut, her friends honored Antonina B. Parker on March 16 at "Nina's Night." Mr. Speaker, I ask the Congress to join me, along with her many friends, in expressing our profound gratitude and deep admiration to Antonina B. Parker.●

**A TRIBUTE TO JOHN C. FELTSCHER**

**HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING**

OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to commend John C. Feldscher for his dedication and accomplishments during his 42 years of service to the energy industry in general, and to the uranium enrichment field in particular.

Mr. Feldscher has been particularly effective in the dissemination of factual and supportive information regarding enrichment activities, which has resulted in mustering and maintaining the necessary legislative support of this program by various Members of Congress and their staff.

The energy industry will have lost a most articulate and effective defender of their cause in John C. Feldscher's retirement, Mr. Speaker, and I would join his friends and colleagues who would wish him well in his retirement.●

**DESPITE INJUSTICE NISEI FOUGHT BRAVELY IN WORLD WAR II**

**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, March 19, 1985*

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the San Jose Mercury recently published a letter to the editor opposing the concept of redress for Americans of Japanese ancestry who were interned during World War II. The writer of that letter suggested that service in the Armed Forces was equivalent to the internment, and that, therefore, those interned are not entitled to any particular governmental response.

As an enthusiastic supporter of H.R. 442, the Civil Liberties Act of 1985, I obviously disagree with the letter. I believe that those interned suffered a unique deprivation of their basic constitutional rights, which is not at all similar to the physical hardships of military life. As a former internee and

as one who served with our military intelligence service during the Korean War, I have personal experience with both sets of circumstances.

I wish to call to my colleagues' attention a response to the letter published in the San Jose Mercury of March 9, 1985. This letter was from retired Judge Wayne M. Kanemoto. I have been an admirer and friend of Judge Kanemoto for most of my adult life, and I am delighted to provide this copy of his letter. Judge Kanemoto's thoughts are particularly timely and articulate, and I urge my colleagues to consider his views with care and attention.

The letter as published follows:

[From the San Jose Mercury, Mar. 9, 1985]  
**DESPITE INJUSTICE NISEI FOUGHT BRAVELY IN WORLD WAR II**

Warren A. Rouse asks in his March 4 letter if any member of the San Jose Commission on the Internment of Local Japanese Americans remembers Pearl Harbor. As a member of that commission, I would like to respond that I do, indeed, remember Pearl Harbor.

I was then a third-year law student at the University of Santa Clara. I was able to finish law school, as the orders for evacuation of the San Jose area came toward the end of May, 1942. I received my diploma among the horse stables of the Santa Anita race track. I was allowed to take the bar examinations, but only under escort to and from examinations.

I then spent a year in a relocation center in the deserts of Arizona, where I worked for \$16 to \$19 per month.

Subsequently, having enlisted in the U.S. Army, I received a pay raise to \$21 per month. I also did forced marches while combat training in the backwoods of Mississippi from June to October.

And all the while, my parents, three sisters, relatives and friends were in the relocation centers. They were citizens of the United States under the Constitution, which provides that "life, liberty or property" shall not be deprived "without due process of law." Yet they were never charged with having done anything unlawful or contrary to the welfare of the country, never had a hearing or trial, never had the opportunity to defend themselves and their loyalty, never had anything resembling "due process of law." Simply being of Japanese ancestry automatically condemned us all in the eyes of our government.

Following combat infantry training, I was ordered by the U.S. Army to learn Japanese and was assigned to military intelligence, eventually serving in the jungles of Burma.

After the war, even high military and government officials admitted there was no military reason to have any of the loyal Japanese-Americans incarcerated after mid-1943, when there was no conceivable danger of an invasion of our shores by Japanese forces.

I, my parents, relatives and friends had nothing to do with causing Pearl Harbor or the Bataan death march. We, too, were horrified by these events. Many of us (33,000 through the war and occupation) left our families behind barbed-wire fences and went to fight for the cause of our native land.

Young Japanese-American men earned, among other decorations, 9,486 Purple Hearts, 560 Silver Stars, 52 Distinguished

Service Crosses, one Congressional Medal of Honor and seven Presidential Unit Citations. The all-Japanese-American 442nd Regimental Combat Team came to be the most decorated unit of its size in the history of the U.S. Army.

And we lost, not only three or four years out of our lives, but also our homes, property, jobs, liberty and an opportunity to be useful members of our communities.

Mr. Rouse, do you believe in "liberty and justice for all?" We, Japanese Americans, fought to preserve democracy and the sacred principles enunciated in our Constitution. ●

#### FRAUDULENT MEDICAL CREDENTIALS: THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL RESPONSE

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you and my other House colleagues may have read articles in the papers recently concerning phony doctors—unqualified individuals working as physicians with fraudulent credentials. Much of this attention can be attributed to a hearing on this issue held by the Select Committee on Aging, Subcommittee on Health and Long-Term Care, December 7, 1984.

The hearing featured a variety of people affected by the problem of fraudulent medical degrees—promoters of bogus M.D. programs, purchasers of fraudulent credentials, family members of victims of phony doctors, directors of State medical licensing boards, and representatives from the Federal agencies charged with combating this problem. What we learned was that fraudulent medical credentials is an alarming and pervasive problem that shows no sign of warning unless met with a strong Federal response.

Out of the subcommittee investigation, it was determined that as many as 10,000 phony doctors are practicing in the United States today. Although one promoter of phony medical degrees was arrested and did testify, he himself estimates that as many as 20 other dealers are still operating.

Another point to be reckoned with is this: Federal funds are fueling the phony M.D. fire. Many of the purchasers of phony credentials are financing their education with guaranteed student loans and loans from the Veterans Administration. These students return to the United States unable either to pass exams enabling them to practice medicine or repay their Government loans. Thus this problem, aside from its shocking ethical implications, is costing the Government over \$20 million annually.

To curb the further growth of these degree fraud schemes and to reverse this very dangerous trend, I have proposed three bills which I feel will have

a significant impact on the flow and practice of phony doctors.

The first bill is designed to affect the brokers of fraudulent medical degree scams. It would amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the criminal penalties for mail fraud. Minimum fines of \$1,000 will be raised to \$10,000 and minimum prison sentences of 6 months will be increased to 15 years. According to law enforcement agencies, this will serve to place penalties in proper relation to the potential harm posed by these types of frauds. Perhaps the best way to stop the growth in the number of phony doctors is to permanently stop the business of supplying fraudulent M.D.'s.

The second would make it a felony to practice medicine with bogus credentials in any federally funded program, such as Medicare, Medicaid and the armed services. Currently these individuals are subject to minor penalties which vary from State to State. Penalties befitting the crime only occur after the fact—when some tragedy has occurred and someone has been injured. There is also at present some confusion about jurisdiction—which Federal body will prosecute whom? This measure will put an end to such confusion and lead to promptly imposed, more severe penalties appropriate to the crime.

The third bill is designed to prevent the Government from permitting these fraudulent degree operations. Under existing Federal regulations, the only criterion for determining a school's eligibility for Government guaranteed loans is that the school be recognized and listed with the World Health Organization [WHO]. Unfortunately, the WHO does not examine quality of training and facilities of listed schools and instead lists all institutions recognized by that school's host country. This situation has led to a sevenfold increase in the number of WHO-recognized, for-profit medical schools in the Dominican Republic, for example.

Under this bill, any medical school outside the United States and Canada would have to go through the same tough certification standards that the United States and Canadian schools are already subjected to before being eligible for Federal loans. I believe this law would ensure a quality education to our students studying abroad, would prevent the proliferation of for-profit institutions, and would stop the loss of an estimated \$20 million each year in defaulted student loans by persons unable to pass licensure examinations or repay their Government loans.

The problem of phony doctors and fraudulent credentials is indeed a very serious one in the United States. In these times, when health care costs weigh heavily on all our minds, we

cannot permit the millions of dollars of waste to continue, nor the serious danger posed to the public health.

Mr. Speaker, two people made a very special contribution in guiding the direction of this legislation: Mr. Ronald Schwartz, Assistant Deputy Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services while on detail to the subcommittee; and Mr. Richard Ehling, a recent graduate of Dartmouth College and intern to the subcommittee. They should be commended for the research and data collection necessary to prepare these bills.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in the support of this important and timely reform legislation. A full text of the three bills follows:

H.R. 1581

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the existing penalties for mail fraud and to provide for criminal and civil forfeitures for such offense

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PENALTIES.

Section 1341 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000", and
- (2) by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years".

#### SEC. 2. FORFEITURES.

(a) SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENT.—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### "§ 1346. Criminal forfeiture

"(a) A person who is convicted of an offense under section 1341 of this title shall forfeit to the United States such person's interest in—

"(1) any property constituting or derived from gross profits or other proceeds obtained from such offense; and

"(2) any property used, or intended to be used, to commit such offense.

"(b) In any action under this section, the court may enter such restraining orders or take other appropriate action (including acceptance of performance bonds) in connection with any interest that is subject to forfeiture.

"(c) The court shall order forfeiture of property referred to in subsection (a) if the trier of fact determines, beyond a reasonable doubt, that such property is subject to forfeiture.

"(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, the customs laws relating to disposition of seized or forfeited property shall apply to property under this section, if such laws are not consistent with this section.

"(2) In any disposition of property under this section, a convicted person shall not be permitted to acquire property forfeited by such person.

"(3) The duties of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to dispositions of property shall be performed under paragraph (1) of this subsection by the Attorney General, unless such duties arise from forfeitures effected under the customs laws.

##### "§ 1347. Civil forfeiture

"(a) Any property constituting or derived from gross profits or other proceeds obtained from a violation of section 1341 shall

be subject to forfeiture to the United States, except that no property shall be forfeited under this section, to the extent of the interest of an owner, by reason of any act or omission established by that owner to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of that owner.

"(b) All provisions of the customs law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of property for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such property or the proceeds from the sale thereof, the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures, and the compromise of claims, shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under subsection (a), insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, except that such duties as are imposed upon the customs officer or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of property under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of property under this section by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General, except to the extent that such duties arise from seizures and forfeitures effected by any customs officer."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1343 the following new items:

- "1346. Criminal forfeiture.
- "1347. Civil forfeiture."

H.R. 1582

A bill to make students studying in foreign medical schools ineligible for Federal loans or loan guarantees unless the medical school meets certain accreditation standards

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
SECTION 1. PROHIBITION OF LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—No loans may be made by the United States or under any program which receives Federal financial assistance to a student in a medical school outside the United States or Canada unless the medical school meets accreditation standards established under section 2. No loan guarantee may be made by the United States for a student in such a medical school unless the program meets such standards.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to academic years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ACCREDITATION OF FOREIGN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Education and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall jointly make arrangements under which schools of medicine outside the United States or Canada can be accredited under the same system and on the same basis as medical schools located in the United States or Canada. To receive an accreditation a school shall make an application to the Secretary and the Administrator in such form and manner as the Secretary and Administrator shall prescribe. No application may be approved unless the applicant has submitted funds for payment to the accrediting agency of the costs of the accrediting. No school may apply for an accreditation if more than 25 percent of the students trained by the school in any academic year are not residents of the country in which

the school is located. Upon application, the Secretary and the Administrator may waive the limitation of the preceding sentence if they determine that application of the limitation to the applicant school will not serve the purpose for which the limitation is imposed.●

H.R. 1583

A bill to make it unlawful for an individual to obtain a position as a physician or resident in a hospital receiving Federal funds if the individual's license to practice medicine was obtained through intentional misrepresentations

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

That it is unlawful for any individual to obtain a position as—

- (1) a physician, or
- (2) a student in a graduate medical education program,

in any hospital or other medical facility which receives funds under title XVIII of the Social Security Act or under a State plan approved under title XIX of such Act or any other Federal funds if the individual's license to practice medicine was procured through an intentional misrepresentation of material fact (including cheating on an examination required for licensing). Any individual who violates this Act shall be fined \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both.

EDUCATION THEMES

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1985

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1985, my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Ohio, Mr. STOKES, delivered the convocation speech at the 118th Charter Day of Howard University.

The speech focused on three primary themes. The first was the importance of education to the black Americans and other minority groups. Second, Congressman STOKES, in his remarks, underscored the important role that historically black institutions, like Howard University, here played in terms of educating black Americans. Lastly, the Stokes speech focused on the need for a strong commitment by the Federal Government to programs which aid both minority students and those institutions which serve them.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remarks of my colleague, Mr. STOKES be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONVOCATION SPEECH OF HON. LOUIS STOKES

President Cheek, Dr. Geraldine Woods and other members of the board of trustees, faculty, students, friends and guests, it is my privilege and high honor to be your Charter Day Convocation Speaker. I can sincerely tell you that this is a highlight of my congressional career—not only because Howard University is a citadel of intellectual, cultural and political achievement—but also because I have had a longstanding and

personal relationship with this university. Last spring, I proudly witnessed the graduation of my daughter, Angie, from the Howard University School of Law. She is now an assistant attorney general for the State of Ohio. Another daughter, Lori, is currently a Howard University undergraduate. I am proud to be affiliated with this great institution and, can now boldly share in some of the braggadocio of my daughter, Angie, when she boasts of being a Howard alumna.

I also deem it an honor to be here today at the invitation of the president of this university, Dr. Cheek, who is one of America's most highly respected and distinguished educators. Whenever he appears on Capitol Hill to represent this university he has made me proud to be associated with him. Likewise, this university is well represented on the Hill on their appearances before the Appropriations Committee by Dr. Roger Estep, Caspa Harris, Dr. Carleton Alexis, Haines Rice and Dr. Michael Winston. Others whom I have worked closely with on matters related to this university are my good friends, Vice President Carl Anderson and the chairman of the board, Dr. Geraldine Woods. The competence of all of the people is an asset to this university which you should cherish.

Let me also take a moment of your time to acknowledge the presence of my Washington office staff who have joined me today, and whom I think of as an extension of my own family. Lastly, I want to acknowledge the presence of my wife, Jay, and two of my daughters, Shelley and Lori.

Today as we celebrate the 118th anniversary of the founding of Howard University, we have much to cherish and to be proud of. I recall when the late President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, met with the Congressional Black Caucus about a year prior to his death. After telling us how proud he was to meet with us, and how he identified with us because of his mother, whom he described as being completely black, he said: I come to you today with a history of culture that is 3,000 years old". He said it with authority and pride. We sat there that morning trying to conceive of the feeling one must have in being able to trace one's culture back over a period of 3,000 years.

We can celebrate the 118th birthday of this institution with a similar pride and the knowledge that in 118 years, Howard University has educated some of this Nation's most outstanding and distinguished black Americans. Since the signing of the Howard University Charter by President Andrew Johnson on March 2, 1867, designating Howard as the "The university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences", Howard University has withstood many storms and turbulent winds. And, it has done so because it has had a great purpose. Howard University has never swayed from its course or its mission to be a creative and moral force in the education of black people and the development of humankind.

As we gather here today inspired and imbued with the illustrious achievements of Howard University since it first chartered its course, and as we look back on our history, we must also look forward to our future. We must put into perspective where we are today—if we are to understand where we are going tomorrow.

As we gather at this institution of higher learning today, we do so in the midst of a growing national debate about excellence in education. As persons concerned with

higher education I need not tell you that our Nation's schools, at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels, have recently been found to be sadly lacking in adequately educating American students for the 21st century and beyond. Education has, in fact, been on trial in recent months as never before. The subject of education and how to improve it has been at the forefront of the debate at the national level, in Congress, in State legislatures, and in local communities.

Now the clarion call for this serious reexamination of our Nation's schools was the publication last year by a blue ribbon commission on excellence in education of their report entitled: "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform". This report should be made mandatory reading for all Americans. One of the most striking statements in the report is the following language: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves \* \* \* we have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament".

We have learned from this report that the risk is not only that the Japanese make automobiles more efficiently than Americans and have government subsidies for development and export. It is not just that the South Koreans recently built the world's most efficient steel mill, or that American tools, once the pride of the world, are being displaced by German products. It is also that these developments signify a redistribution of trained capability throughout the globe. That knowledge, learning, information and skilled intelligence are the new raw materials of international commerce and are today spreading throughout the world as vigorously as miracle drugs, synthetic fertilizers, and blue jeans did earlier.

The report stated in a very emphatic way that "The people of the United States need to know that individuals in our society who do not possess the levels of skill, literacy and training essential to this new era will be effectively disenfranchised". Now it seems to me that if a report which speaks to America's general youth population makes this kind of dramatic statement. Such a statement should be examined closely for its impact upon minorities who have historically suffered disenfranchisement.

It is important for us to realize that we now live in an era when the media likes to refer to America's new black middle class as though all of us live in that class. Many of us have even gotten caught up in this media hype. Many of us have gotten caught up in our new suburban homes with swimming pools and hot tubs. In cars, we are past the Cadillac stage. Now we drive Mercedes Benz and Porsche. And not only are we driving the cars—we are making the payments on time. Black men don't even wear GGG suits anymore. Now its Pierre Cardin, Calvin Klein and Giorgio suits, and just so the men don't out do them, the women are being chic in their Ralph Lauren and Oscar De LaRente dresses and Gucci bags. And who would think of jetting across country today without his Louis Jourdan or Feragamo shoes, and his Louis Vuitton luggage, while he checks the time on his Lucien Picard watch.

And while some black people live like this, the vast majority of black people today do not live like this. Black youth in America today are unemployed at three times the

rate of their white counterparts. Black males are unemployed at twice the rate of their counterparts. The media now writes of what they call a permanent underclass of black youth who are born in the basement of American society and who go from one generation to another unfed, under-clothed, ill-housed, ill-educated and hostile to a society which has relegated them to a category at the bottom of the ladder from which there is no escape. It is sad that many of us who fall into the category of having "made it" do not concern ourselves with reaching back to help pull our black brothers and sisters up with us.

How can we abandon the struggle for equality, when the issues we anguished and agonized over 20 years ago are the same ones we confront today. The problems facing black Americans loom larger today than in 1968. What it means is that we struggled through the years of protest and demonstrations only to achieve the illusion of power and equality.

As we celebrate the 118th anniversary of this university we must be painfully mindful that the same system nationally producing your current student population also produces 40 percent of our 17 year olds who cannot draw inferences from written material; only one-third of whom can solve a mathematics problem requiring several steps.

Today we are faced with evidence of technology radically transforming occupations such as health care, medical science, energy production, food processing, construction, and the building repair and maintenance of sophisticated scientific, educational, military and industrial equipment. Yet educational researcher, Paul Hurd, has concluded that within the context of the modern scientific revolution, "We are raising a new generation of American that is scientifically and technologically illiterate".

Now these deficiencies are coming at a time when computers and computer-controlled equipment are penetrating every aspect of our lives. At a time when it is estimated that by the turn of the Century millions of jobs will involve laser technology and robotics.

The American Society of Engineers estimates that by the end of the decade, 50 percent of the positions available on the plant floor will be held by highly skilled engineers and technicians servicing and maintaining the computers and robots actually producing the Nation's durable goods.

I also think that it is shocking to learn that the average graduate of our schools and colleges today is not as well educated as the average graduate of 25 or 35 years ago.

The recommendations contained in the report of the national commission stimulated a tremendously positive period of self-examination and reform at the elementary and secondary school levels. But the commission's analysis also precipitated a call for an examination of America's higher education.

As a result of this, Dr. Manuel Justiz, Director of the National Institute of Education, appointed a study group on the conditions of excellence in American higher education. This study group was appointed in October, 1983, and released its report in November, 1984. The report is entitled, "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education".

We learn from this report that higher education, through our colleges, community colleges and universities, enrolls more than 12 million students, employs nearly 2 mil-

lion workers and accounts for 3 percent of the gross national product. Additionally, more than half of all undergraduates are women and one out of every six is a member of a minority group. Among the most shocking findings of this study is that only half of all students who start college actually graduate four years later with a college degree.

I consider this to be a tragic situation. Clearly, our Nation's educational system is failing to tap and fully develop a significant pool of human talent. We have a tremendous wealth of intellectual ability and ingenuity in our young people which is being wasted. Yet, notably absent from the current debate is any reference to the meaning of "educational excellence" for black, disadvantaged and other minority group students. The national dialogue has not yet focused on the question of what it will take to ensure that all students have a fair chance to achieve excellence.

Today and in the future, all students will be expected to take more courses in academic subjects, to meet more demanding standards and to perform at a higher level. We must not allow, however, the pursuit of excellence to overshadow the goals of equality and opportunity in education. Excellence, equality and opportunity in education are not mutually exclusive.

The commission's report makes reference to a recent report of the national forum on learning in the American future which makes it clear that higher education has begun to subordinate minority issues to other concerns. Although minority issues were generally given high priority as present goals, they were rated very low among future goals.

The basic reason for this study of higher education was the realization that blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and American Indians all suffer from powerlessness, and higher education is clearly one of the main routes whereby individuals can attain positions of economic and political power.

I am certain that this is what prompted Dr. Donald H. Smith, president of the National Alliance of Black School Educators, to say, "We educators and other members of the black family must help our people acquire five kinds of empowerment: academic, cultural, psychological, political and economic". He further observed "That a school that is concerned only with reading and math scores or computer literacy will deprive our black students of four-fifths of their survival needs". He stated that "One may excel in reading and math, but if one belongs to a locked out group which has no political or economic power one may still not eat".

So as this new educational reform movement takes place it behooves us to look at it from a black perspective.

We should all be mindful of one of the last sermons preached by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., entitled: "Remaining Awake During a Revolution". In that sermon he talked of how when Rip Van Winkle went up into the mountain to go to sleep he passed a sign that had a picture of King George III of England. When he came down twenty years later, after sleeping twenty years, the same sign had a picture of George Washington on it. Martin explained the moral of the story was that not only had Rip slept twenty years, he had slept through a revolution. Dr. King explained to us that one of the great liabilities of life is that all too many people find themselves living amid a great period of social change and yet they fail to develop the new atti-

tudes, the new mental responses—that the situation demands. He said, “they end up sleeping through a revolution!”

As the revolution in American education unfolds we must be well aware of the facts and the trends. Another recent status report on minorities in higher education by the American Council on Education reveals that at a time when for demographic reasons, black student college attendance should have grown proportionally, the percentage in four year colleges was 8.5 percent in 1976; 8.5 percent in 1978; 8.4 percent in 1980; and 8.0 percent in 1982.

Blacks also saw a disturbing decline in both the numbers and percentage of degrees awarded them between 1976 and 1981. All other minority groups registered increases in degrees received. It is interesting to note that black men have lost ground at every level of earned degrees. The two areas of increased black representation in share of degrees, the B.A. and the Ph.D., is almost entirely due to the increasing percentage of black women participating in higher education. You would be interested in knowing that the combined total of doctoral degrees awarded to U.S. minorities fell short of the total awarded to non-resident aliens. The role of traditionally black institutions continue to be an important source of degrees awarded to blacks. They awarded 32.8 percent of all degrees received by blacks in 1975-76 and by 1980-81, that figure had changed very little, in spite of substantial losses in enrollments at these 109 schools.

This report, after highlighting these disturbing trends, calls for a commitment from the President, Congress, State legislators, the private sector and the philanthropic community to the goal of equal opportunity for a quality education for America's minor-

ity groups. It also called for specific programs and strategies to attain that goal.

The report concludes with this poignant statement: “The prospect of a population that may be 35 percent minority by the year 2020, coupled with the alarming statistics for minority educational attainment, makes it clear that we are headed for a crisis, the consequences of which can be devastating to the country's continued prosperity and well being”.

It is this type of report then that enables us to put into perspective the enormous role black colleges have played in our past and the role which they must continue to play in our future.

It is important for us to also note that this tremendous achievement has been accomplished despite more than 100 years of financial starvation, invidious discrimination and blatant disregard at Federal and State levels.

Perhaps the Federal Government's commitment to black colleges can best be described as: On one hand it giveth; on the other hand, it taketh away! More than one-third of all Federal aid to black colleges and universities is derived from student financial assistance; programs that, under President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget proposals, would be slashed by more than 25 percent. More than one million students nationwide would be dropped from the Federal student aid roles. Right here at Howard University, nearly half of the undergraduate student body would be negatively affected by the President's proposals. In short, these proposals would have the effect of undermining America's investment in education and its people at a time when this investment is needed most.

Here at Howard University, there has always been a tradition of leadership and a

determination to be the beacon of light at the top of the hill.

This year we have a historic opportunity to once again carry the mantle of leadership.

We must make the passage of this legislation, with a renewed commitment to historically black colleges, one of the highest national priorities of the black community and of black colleges and universities. Federal programs must and can be shaped to ensure that access to higher education is not left to chance and that black institutions receive real and meaningful levels of support.

This year in Congress as part of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, legislation will be re-introduced entitled, “The Black Colleges and University Act”. This legislation would target a significant infusion of resources for capital improvements, curriculum development, faculty training and library services at historically black institutions. This legislation merits our highest level of commitment. Howard University and other organizations must develop a strategy for the development and passage of this legislation.

Our black colleges continue to face a monumental challenge. As the context of American education shifts, as technology changes the nature of the work we do, and the global setting in which we compete, our schools face a fresh challenge.

In the 1980's the emphasis in the schools must be on quality and equality. Our Nation must accept the challenge of returning a sense of excellence to America's schools. As one of America's premier historically black institutions, Howard University must be in the vanguard of this revolution. I leave you once again with the immortal words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., “It is dangerous to sleep through a revolution!”●

